Campus Crusade for Christ Library

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

R. Godding

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

EDITED WITH

AN INTRODUCTION AND A COMMENTARY

BY

C. G. claude goldsmid MONTEFIORE 1858-1938

TOGETHER WITH A SERIES OF

ADDITIONAL NOTES

BY

I. ABRAHAMS

IN THREE VOLUMES

VOL. II

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON
1909

All rights reserved

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

BS
2555
M774

Campus Crusade for Christ Library

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOL. II.

TRANSLATION OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW (pp. 393—449).

COMMENTARY (WITH TRANSLATION) UPON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW (pp. 450—782).

PAGE

A. The Birth stories. i. 1—ii. 23.

(1) The genealogy of Jesus 450
(2) The Virgin birth 453
(3) The adoration of the Magi 456
(4) The flight into Egypt 457
(5) The massacre of the Innocents 458
(6) The journey to Galilee 458

B. The Baptism, the Temptation and the opening of the Ministry in Galilee. iii. 1—iv. 25.

(1) John the Baptist 461
(2) The Baptism of Jesus 464
(3) The Temptation 465
(4) The return to Galilee 471
(5) The first four Apostles 471
(6) Preaching in Galilee 472

C. The Sermon on the Mount. v. 1—vii. 29.

(1) The Beatitudes 476
(2) The salt and the light 485
(3) Jesus' attitude towards the Law 487
(4) The old Law and the new teaching: (A) Of anger . 497
(5) On reconcilement 504
(6) The old Law and the new teaching: (B) Of adultery . 505
(7) Of temptations and stumbling-blocks 506

9/73

PAGE
(8) The old Law and the new teaching: (C) Of divorce . . 507
(9) " " " (D) Of oaths . . 510
(10) " " " (E) Of retaliation . 512
(11) " " " (F) Love your enemies 518
(12) Of almsgiving 528
(13) Of prayer 530
(14) The Lord's Prayer 532
(15) Of fasting 537
(16) Treasures on earth and in heaven 538
(17) The internal light 539
(18) God and mammon 540
(19) Worldly anxieties and occupations 541
(20) Concerning hasty judgments and condemnations of our neighbour 546
(21) Pearls before swine 547
(22) Of prayer 548
(23) The golden rule 549
(24) The narrow gate 550
(25) The false prophets, and how to know them . . . 551
(26) The good life the only true life of the disciple . . 552
(27) The house on the rock 554
(28) Impression produced by the teaching of Jesus . . 555

D. The Ministry in Galilee and in the territory of Philip. viii. 1—xviii. 35.

(1) Healing of a leper 557
(2) The centurion at Capernaum 558
(3) Peter's mother-in-law 561
(4) Conditions of discipleship 561
(5) Storm at sea 565
(6) The Gadarene demoniacs 565
(7) Healing of a paralytic 567
(8) The call of Matthew: Jesus eats with sinners and tax-collectors 569
(9) Fasting 570
(10) The daughter of Jairus and the woman with an issue . 571
(11) Two blind men and a dumb man are healed . . . 572
(12) The sending of the disciples 573
(13) The discourse to the apostles 576
(14) John the Baptist's inquiries 589
(15) The Baptist and the Son of Man 591
(16) The Galilaean cities are condemned 601
(17) Jesus and his Mission (*a*) The Father and the Son . 603
(18) " " (*b*) The yoke of Jesus . . 608

PAGE
(19) The Sabbath 617
(20) Healing on the Sabbath 618
(21) Many healings 619
(22) Satan and Beelzebul 620
(23) A sign is asked and refused 628
(24) The relapse 632
(25) Jesus and his family 633
(26) The Parable of the Sower 635
(27) The Wheat and the Tares 639
(28) The Mustard Seed and the Leaven 641
(29) Interpretation of the parable of the Wheat and the Tares . 643
(30) The Treasure and the Pearl 644
(31) The Parable of the Net 645
(32) The Householder and his Treasure 646
(33) The rejection in Nazareth 647
(34) Herod, Jesus, and John the Baptist 649
(35) Feeding of the five thousand 650
(36) Jesus walks on the Sea 651
(37) The arrival at Gennesaret 653
(38) Washing of hands 654
(39) The Canaanite woman 656
(40) Fresh healings 658
(41) Feeding of the four thousand 659
(42) A sign is refused 660
(43) Bread and leaven 661
(44) The declaration of Messiahship. The conditions of discipleship 662
(45) The Transfiguration 669
(46) An epileptic child 670
(47) Second prediction of the Passion and Resurrection . 672
(48) On Temple tribute 672
(49) The question of superiority. Of stumbling blocks . . 675
(50) The saving of the lost 678
(51) Duties and lights of the Community 679
(52) The duty of forgiveness and the Parable of the Ungrateful Servant 684

E. Jesus on the way to Jerusalem. xix. 1—xx. 34.

(1) Divorce and adultery 687
(2) Jesus and the children 692
(3) The danger of wealth 693
(4) The Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard . . 699
(5) Third prediction of suffering and death 703

PAGE
(6) The sons of Zebedee 704
(7) Healing of two blind men 705

F. The entry of Jesus into Jerusalem and his teaching in the City. xxi. 1—xxv. 46.

(1) The entry into Jerusalem 706
(2) The purification of the Temple 707
(3) The fig-tree 708
(4) The authority of John 709
(5) The Parable of the Two Sons 710
(6) The Parable of the Vineyard 714
(7) The Parable of the Messianic Banquet 716
(8) Give unto Caesar 719
(9) The resurrection life 720
(10) The greatest commandment 720
(11) Whose Son is the Messiah? 721
(12) Attack upon the Pharisees 723
(13) Lament over Jerusalem 732
(14) The End and its Signs 736
(15) The faithful and the faithless servant 742
(16) The Wise and Foolish Virgins 744
(17) The Parable of the Talents 746
(18) The Day of Judgment 751

G. The Passion and the Resurrection. xxvi. 1—xxviii. 20.

(1) The decision of the priests and scribes 755
(2) The anointing in Bethany 756
(3) Judas's treachery 756
(4) Preparation for the Passover 757
(5) Jesus predicts the betrayal 757
(6) The Last Supper 758
(7) Jesus predicts Peter's denial 759
(8) Gethsemane 759
(9) The arrest 760
(10) The trial before the Sanhedrin 761
(11) The denial of Peter 765
(12) Jesus is brought before Pilate 767
(13) The death of Judas 767
(14) Jesus before Pilate 769
(15) Jesus, Pilate and Barabbas 770
(16) Jesus is mocked by the soldiers 772
(17) The Crucifixion 772
(18) The death of Jesus 773
(19) The women who saw 775

PAGE
(20) The burial of Jesus 775
(21) Roman soldiers watch the grave 776
(22) The empty grave 778
(23) The guile of the Jewish authorities 780
(24) The appearance of the risen Messiah in Galilee . . 780

TRANSLATION OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE (pp. 783—843).

COMMENTARY (WITH TRANSLATION) UPON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE (pp. 844—1099).

A. The Preface. i. 1—4 844

B. The Birth and Infancy Stories. i. 5—ii. 52.

(1) The announcement of the birth of John the Baptist . 845
(2) Prediction of the birth of Jesus 849
(3) The visit of Mary to Elizabeth 851
(4) Birth of John the Baptist 853
(5) The birth of Jesus 856
(6) Circumcision and redemption of Jesus 860
(7) Simeon 860
(8) Anna 862
(9) A story of the boyhood of Jesus 863

C. The Baptism and the Temptation. iii. 1—iv. 13.

(1) John the Baptist 865
(2) The baptism of Jesus 867
(3) The genealogy of Jesus 868
(4) The Temptation 870

D. The Galilaean Ministry. iv. 14—ix. 50.

(1) Jesus in Nazareth 871
(2) The unclean spirit in the synagogue at Capernaum . 876
(3) Peter's mother-in-law 876
(4) Many healings: Jesus leaves the city 877
(5) The call of Peter 878
(6) Healing of a leper 879
(7) Healing of a paralysed man 880
(8) Call of Levi 881
(9) Fasting 881
(10) The Sabbath 883

PAGE
(11) Election of the twelve Apostles 884
(12) The Sermon in the Plain 885
(13) " " The Beatitudes and the Woes . 888
(14) " " The love of enemies . . 889
(15) " " Against judging and condemning one's neighbour . . . 892
(16) " " The criterion of virtue . . 894
(17) " " Hearing and doing . . . 894
(18) The centurion and his servant 895
(19) The young man of Nain 896
(20) John the Baptist and his inquiries 897
(21) Love and forgiveness 901
(22) Jesus and his wanderings 907
(23) The Parable of the Sower 908
(24) The hidden and the revealed 909
(25) Jesus and his family 909
(26) The storm on the lake 910
(27) The Gadarene swine 910
(28) The daughter of Jairus and the woman with an issue . 911
(29) The despatch of the Apostles 913
(30) Jesus and Herod Antipas 913
(31) The feeding of the five thousand 914
(32) Jesus the Messiah: the conditions of discipleship . . 915
(33) The Transfiguration 919
(34) The epileptic child 920
(35) Second prediction of suffering 921
(36) Who is the greatest? 921

E. "The great Insertion": (Jesus journeys through Samaria towards Jerusalem). ix. 51—xviii. 14.

(1) The journey to Jerusalem: the Samaritan village . . 922
(2) Discipleship and its conditions 926
(3) The seventy disciples 927
(4) The return of the disciples 930
(5) The Father and the Son 931
(6) The happy eye-witnesses 931
(7) The acquisition of eternal life and the Good Samaritan . 932
(8) Martha and Mary 937
(9) On prayer 939
(10) Jesus and Beelzebul 942
(11) Jesus and his mother 943
(12) The sign of Jonah 943
(13) Similes about light 944
(14) Against the Pharisees 945

PAGE
(15) The disciples are to proclaim Christ openly and fearlessly . 951
(16) Against covetousness. The Parable of the Rich Fool . 954
(17) Against anxious care for mundane matters . . . 955
(18) Treasure in heaven 957
(19) Watch: the Lord cometh 957
(20) The wise and foolish steward 959
(21) Signs of the End 960
(22) Use the short time that awaits you and repent . . 963
(23) The slaughtered Galilaeans and the tower of Siloam. The Parable of the Barren Fig-Tree 964
(24) The woman healed on the Sabbath 966
(25) Parables of Mustard and Leaven 967
(26) The narrow gate 967
(27) Departure from Galilee 969
(28) Lament over Jerusalem 971
(29) Healing the man with dropsy 973
(30) Banquet rules 974
(31) The Messianic banquet 976
(32) True discipleship and its conditions: its cost should be counted beforehand 978
(33) God's love of the repentant sinner: the Parables of the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin 983
(34) The Prodigal Son 988
(35) The Parable of the Unjust Steward 992
(36) The right use of money is the test of a man's fitness for the kingdom 996
(37) Pharisees and the Law 997
(38) The story of the Rich and the Poor Man . . . 1001
(39) On scandals or stumbling-blocks 1007
(40) On forgiveness 1007
(41) On faith 1007
(42) The slave and his reward 1008
(43) The healing of the ten lepers 1009
(44) The when and where of the Parousia 1010
(45) The Parable of the Unjust Judge 1017
(46) The tax-collector and the Pharisee 1021

F. Jesus approaches Jerusalem. xviii. 15—xix. 27.

(1) Jesus and the children 1022
(2) The danger of riches 1023
(3) Renewed prediction of suffering and death and resurrection 1024
(4) Healing of Bartimaeus 1025
(5) Zacchaeus and the tax-collector 1026
(6) The Parable of the Talents 1028

PAGE

G. The Entry of Jesus into Jerusalem and his Teaching in the City. xix. 28—xxi. 38.

(1) The entry into Jerusalem 1031
(2) Prediction of the fall of Jerusalem 1033
(3) The cleansing of the Temple 1033
(4) The authority of Jesus and of John 1035
(5) The Parable of the Vineyard 1035
(6) Give unto Caesar 1037
(7) The life of the resurrection 1037
(8) Is the Messiah David's Son? 1040
(9) An attack on the Scribes 1041
(10) The widow's mite 1042
(11) The Parousia, the End and its Signs 1042

H. The Passion and Resurrection. xxii. 1—xxiv. 53.

(1) The decision of the authorities 1047
(2) The betrayal 1047
(3) The preparation for the Passover meal 1048
(4) The Last Supper 1049
(5) Prediction of the betrayal 1053
(6) Who is the greatest? 1054
(7) The prediction of the denial of Peter 1059
(8) Purse and sword 1061
(9) Gethsemane 1065
(10) The arrest 1066
(11) Jesus is brought to the house of the High Priest . . 1068
(12) The treatment of Jesus by the guard 1069
(13) The trial before the Sanhedrin 1070
(14) Jesus before Pilate 1073
(15) Pilate and Herod 1074
(16) Jesus and Barabbas 1076
(17) Jesus and the women of Jerusalem 1078
(18) The crucifixion 1079
(19) The death of Jesus 1082
(20) The burial of Jesus 1084
(21) The empty grave 1087
(22) The appearance at Emmaus 1090
(23) The appearance at Jerusalem 1094

APPENDIX 1100

INDEX 1111

MATTHEW

CHAPTER I

Book of the origin of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham. Abraham begat Isaac; and Isaac begat Jacob; and Jacob begat Judah and his brothers; and Judah begat Phares and Zara of Thamar; and Phares begat Esrom; and Esrom begat Aram; and Aram begat Aminadab; and Aminadab begat Naasson; and Naasson begat Salmon; and Salmon begat Boaz of Rachab; and Boaz begat Obed of Ruth; and Obed begat Jesse; and Jesse begat David the king; and David begat Solomon of the wife of Uriah; and Solomon begat Rehoboam; and Rehoboam begat Abia; and Abia begat Asa; and Asa begat Jehosaphat; and Jehosaphat begat Joram; and Joram begat Oziah; and Oziah begat Jotham; and Jotham begat Achaz; and Achaz begat Hezekiah; and Hezekiah begat Manasseh; and Manasseh begat Amon; and Amon begat Josiah; and Josiah begat Jechoniah and his brothers, about the time of the Babylonian captivity; and after the captivity of Babylon, Jechoniah begat Salathiel; and Salathiel begat Zorobabel; and Zorobabel begat Abiud; and Abiud begat Eliakim; and Eliakim begat Azor; and Azor begat Sadoc; and Sadoc begat Achim; and Achim begat Eliud; and Eliud begat Eleazar; and Eleazar begat Matthan; and Matthan begat Jacob; and Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called the Christ.

So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; and from David until the Babylonian captivity are fourteen generations; and from the Babylonian captivity unto Christ are fourteen generations.

Now the birth of Jesus Christ happened thus. After his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, but before they came together, it was found that she was with child of the Holy Spirit. Then Joseph her husband, being a righteous man, and not willing to expose her to shame, determined to divorce her secretly. But while he thought over these things, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, 'Joseph, son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which hath been begotten in her is of the Holy Spirit. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins.'

Now all this took place that that might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet, saying, 'Behold, the virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel,' which being translated is, God is with us.

And when Joseph arose from his sleep, he did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife. And he knew her not till she brought forth a son: and he called his name Jesus.

CHAPTER II

Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judæa in the days of Herod the king, behold, there came Magi from the east to Jerusalem, saying, 'Where is the new-born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and have come to do him reverence.' When king Herod heard this, he was agitated, and all Jerusalem with him. And he gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, and he enquired of them where the Messiah was to be born. And they said unto him, 'In Bethlehem of Judæa: for thus it is written by the prophet, And thou Bethlehem, land of Juda, art by no means the least among the governors of Juda: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall feed my people Israel.' Then Herod secretly called the Magi, and ascertained from them the time when the star had appeared. And he sent them to Bethlehem, and said, 'Go and make careful enquiries about the child; and when ye have found him, bring me word again, that I too may come and do him reverence.' When they had heard the king, they departed; and, lo, the star, which they had seen in the east, went before them, till it came and stood still above where the child was. When they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy.

And when they came into the house, they saw the child with Mary his mother, and they fell down, and did him reverence: and they opened their treasures, and they offered unto him gifts; gold and frankincense and myrrh. And being warned by God in a dream not to return to Herod, they departed into their own country by another way.

And after they had departed, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream, saying, 'Arise, and take the child and his mother, and flee into Egypt, and be thou there until I tell thee: for Herod is about to seek the child to destroy him.' So he arose, and he took the child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt. And he was there until the death of Herod: that that might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet, saying, 'Out of Egypt have I called my son.'

Then Herod, when he saw that the Magi had deluded him, was exceeding wroth, and he sent and slew all the male children that were in Bethlehem, and in all its district, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had ascertained from the Magi. Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremiah the prophet, saying, 'A voice is heard in Rama; weeping and much lamentation; Rachel weepeth for her children, and will not be comforted, because they are not.'

But when Herod died, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared in a dream to Joseph in Egypt, saying, 'Arise, take the child and his mother, and go to the land of Israel: for they who sought the child's life are dead.' So he arose, and took the child and his mother, and came to the land of Israel. But when he heard that Archelaus was king over Judæa in the place of his father Herod, he was afraid to go thither: but, being warned by God in a dream, he withdrew into the region of Galilee. And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that that might be fulfilled which was spoken through the prophets, 'He shall be called a Nazarene.'

CHAPTER III

In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judæa, and saying, 'Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven hath drawn nigh.' For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Isaiah, saying, 'The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.' And John had his clothing of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins; and his food was locusts and wild honey. Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judæa, and all the region round about the Jordan, and they were baptized by him in the Jordan, confessing their sins.

But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to the baptism, he said unto them, 'O offspring of vipers, who hath suggested to you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth, then, fruit befitting repentance: and think not to say to yourselves, We have Abraham for father: for I say unto you, that God is able to raise up children unto Abraham from these stones. Already is the axe laid unto the root of the trees: every tree, then, which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. I baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he will baptize you with Holy Spirit, and fire. His winnowing fan is in his hand, and he will purify his threshing floor, and gather his wheat into the granary; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.'

Then Jesus came from Galilee to the Jordan unto John, to be baptized by him. But John sought to prevent him, saying, 'I need to be baptized by thee, and comest thou to me?' But Jesus answered and said unto him, 'Permit it for the present; for thus it befitteth us to fulfil all righteousness.' Then he permitted him. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and coming upon him: and, lo, a voice from heaven, saying, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.'

CHAPTER IV

Then was Jesus led up by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil. And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, afterwards he hungered. And the Tempter came up to him, and said, 'If thou be the Son of God, say that these stones may become bread.' But he answered and said, 'It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.' Then the devil took him up into the holy city, and set him upon the pinnacle of the temple, and said unto him, 'If thou be the Son of God, throw thyself down: for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.' Jesus said unto him, 'Again it is written, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' Then the devil took him up again on to an exceeding high mountain, and shewed him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them; and he said unto him, 'All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and do me reverence.' Then said Jesus unto him, 'Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt do reverence to the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.' Then the devil left him, and, behold, angels came and ministered unto him.

Now when Jesus heard that John had been delivered up, he withdrew into Galilee. And leaving Nazareth, he came and dwelt in Capernaum, which is by the lake, in the district of Zebulon and Naphthali: that that might be fulfilled which was spoken through Isaiah, the prophet, saying, 'The land of Zebulon, and the land of Naphthali, towards the lake, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the gentiles; the people which sat in darkness hath seen a great light; and to them who sat in the region and shadow of death a light hath arisen.'

From that time Jesus began to proclaim and say, 'Repent: for the kingdom of heaven hath drawn nigh.'

And Jesus, walking by the lake of Galilee, saw two brothers, Simon called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the lake: for they were fishermen. And he said unto them, 'Come hither after me, and I will make you fishers of men.' And they straightway left their nets, and followed him.

And going on from there, he saw two other brothers, James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, in a boat, with Zebedee their father, mending their nets; and he called them. And they immediately left the boat and their father, and followed him.

And Jesus went about in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and proclaiming the Good Tidings of the kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people. And the report of him went out through all Syria: and they brought unto him all that were suffering with divers diseases and afflicted with torments, and those who were possessed with demons, and those who were moonstruck and paralyzed; and he healed them. And there followed him great crowds of people from Galilee, and from the Ten Cities, and from Jerusalem, and from Judæa, and from beyond Jordan.

CHAPTER V

And seeing the crowds, he went up the mountain: and when he sat down, his disciples came up to him. And he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying,

'Happy are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Happy are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted. Happy are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. Happy are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be satisfied. Happy are the pitiful: for they shall be pitied. Happy are the pure in heart: for they shall see God. Happy are the peacemakers: for they shall be called sons of God. Happy are they who are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Happy are ye, when men revile you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and exult: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets who were before you.

'Ye are the salt of the earth: but if salt lose its savour, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, except to be thrown away and trodden under men's feet. Ye are the light of the world. A city that lieth on a mountain cannot be hidden. Neither do men light a lamp, and put it under the bushel, but upon the lampstand; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Even so let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven.

'Think not that I came to destroy the Law or the Prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the Law, till all be fulfilled. Whoever then annulleth one of these least commandments, and teacheth men so, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven: but whoever doeth and teacheth them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I say unto you, That unless your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven.

'Ye have heard that it was said to the men of old time, Thou shalt do no murder; and whoever doeth murder shall be liable to the court. But I say unto you, That whoever is angry with his brother shall be liable to the court: and whoever shall say to his brother, *Raca*, shall be liable to the high court; and whoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be liable to the Gehenna of fire.

'If then thou bring thy offering to the altar, and thou remember there that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave thy offering there before the altar, and go, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and bring thy offering.

'Become friends with thine opponent quickly, whilst thou art still on the way with him; lest thy opponent deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the last farthing.

'Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, That whoever looketh on a woman to desire her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

'And if thy right eye cause thee to stumble, tear it out, and throw it from thee: for it is better for thee that one of thy members should perish, rather than that thy whole body should be thrown into hell. And if thy right hand cause thee to stumble, cut it off, and throw it from thee: for it is better for thee that one of thy members should perish, rather than that thy whole body should come into hell.

'It hath been said, Whoever would divorce his wife, let him give her a bill of divorce: but I say unto you, That whoever divorceth his wife, except for unchastity, causeth her to commit adultery: and whoever marrieth a woman that is divorced committeth adultery.

'Again, ye have heard that it hath been said to the men of old time, Thou shalt not swear falsely, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: but I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by the heaven, for it is God's throne: nor by the earth, for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King. And swear not by thy head, for thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your speech be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatever is more than these cometh from wickedness.

'Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, Resist not the wicked; but whoever smiteth thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man want to go to law with thee, and to take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whoever forceth thee to go one mile, go with him two. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that wanteth to borrow from thee turn not away.

'Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, and pray for them who persecute you; that ye may become the children of your Father who is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the wicked and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them who love you, what reward have ye? do not even the tax-collectors the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the tax-collectors the same? Ye, then, shall be perfect, even as your Father who is in heaven is perfect.

CHAPTER VI

'Take heed that ye perform not your righteousness before men, to be seen by them: otherwise ye have no reward from your Father who is in heaven. So then, when thou givest alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may be glorified by men. Verily I say unto you, They receive their reward. But when thou givest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth: that thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father, who looketh upon what is secret, will reward thee.

'And when ye pray, ye shall not be as the hypocrites: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen by men. Verily I say unto you, They receive their reward. But thou, when thou prayest, enter thy chamber, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father who is in secret; and thy Father, who looketh upon what is secret, will reward thee.

'And when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking. Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what ye need, before ye ask him. After this manner therefore pray ye:

'Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so also upon earth. Our daily bread give us to-day. And forgive us our debts, as we too have forgiven our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil.

'For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: but if ye forgive not men, your Father will also not forgive you your trespasses.

'Moreover when ye fast, look not gloomy like the hypocrites, for they make their faces unsightly, that they may appear unto men to be fasting. Verily I say unto you, They receive their reward. But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash thy face; that thou appear not unto men to be fasting, but unto thy Father who is in secret: and thy Father, who looketh upon what is secret, will reward thee.

'Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust destroy, and where thieves break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth destroy, and where thieves do not break through or steal: for where your treasure is, there also will your heart be.

'The lamp of the body is the eye: if thine eye be sound, thy whole body will be light. But if thine eye be bad, thy whole body will be dark. If, then, the light that is in thee be darkness, how great the darkness!

'No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will cleave to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

'Therefore I say unto you, Be not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat; nor for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than food, and the body than clothing? Look at the birds of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; and your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not worth much more than they? Which of you by anxious care can add one cubit unto his height? And why are ye anxious about clothing? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: and yet I say unto you that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. But if God so clothe the herbs of the field, which to-day are, and to-morrow are thrown into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith? Be not then anxious, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, With what shall we be clothed? For after all these things do the gentiles seek: for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye need all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you. Be not then anxious for the morrow: for the morrow will be anxious for itself. Sufficient for the day is its evil.

CHAPTER VII

'Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you. And why lookest thou at the splinter that is in thy brother's eye, but perceivest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the splinter out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, first pull the beam out of thine own eye; and then wilt thou see clearly to pull the splinter out of thy brother's eye.

'Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you.

'Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: for every one that asketh, receiveth; and he that seeketh, findeth; and to him that knocketh, it shall be opened. Or what man is there among you who, if his son ask him for bread, will give him a stone? Or if he ask him for a fish, will give him a serpent? If then ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father who is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?

'All then that ye would that men should do to you, so do ye also do unto them: for this is the Law and the Prophets.

'Enter through the strait gate: for wide and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there are who enter in thereby. For narrow is the gate, and strait the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there are that find it.

'Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravenous wolves. Ye will know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles? So every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a rotten tree bringeth forth bad fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a rotten tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is cut down, and cast into the fire. So then by their fruits ye will know them.

'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied through thy name? and through thy name have we not cast out demons? and through thy name have we not done many miracles? And then I will declare unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye workers of lawlessness.

'Whoever then heareth these words of mine, and doeth them, shall be likened unto a wise man, who built his house upon the rock: and the rain fell, and the streams came, and the winds blew and beat against that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon the rock. And every one that heareth these words of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand: and the rain fell, and the streams came, and the winds blew and struck against that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it.'

And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these words, the people were amazed at his teaching: for he taught them as one having authority, and not as their scribes.

CHAPTER VIII

When he came down from the mountain, great crowds followed him. And, behold, a leper came up and did him reverence, saying, 'Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.' And Jesus stretched out his hand, and touched him, saying, 'I will; be thou clean.' And immediately his leprosy was cleansed. And Jesus said unto him, 'See thou tell no man; but go, show thyself to the priest, and offer the sacrifice that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.'

And when Jesus entered into Capernaum, there came unto him a centurion, beseeching him, and saying, 'Lord, my boy lieth at home paralyzed, in grievous torment.' And Jesus said unto him, 'I will come and heal him.' The centurion answered and said, 'Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst come under my roof: but only speak the word, and my boy will be healed. For I too am a man under authority, having soldiers under me: and I say to this man, Go, and he goes; and to another, Come, and he comes; and to my servant, Do this, and he does it.'

When Jesus heard it, he marvelled, and said to them that followed, 'Verily I say unto you, Not even in Israel have I found so great faith. And I say unto you, Many will come from the east and west, and will sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom will depart into the outer darkness: there will be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth.' And Jesus said unto the centurion, 'Go; as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee.' And his boy was healed at that hour.

And Jesus came into the house of Peter, and he saw his wife's mother lying in bed with a fever. And he touched her hand, and the fever left her: and she arose, and waited on him.

And when evening had come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with demons: and he cast out the spirits with a word, and healed all that were sick: that what was spoken by Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled, saying, 'Himself he took our sicknesses, and bore our diseases.'

Now when Jesus saw great crowds around him, he gave commandment to cross over to the other side. And a scribe came up, and said unto him, 'Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.' And Jesus said unto him, 'The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.'

And another of the disciples said unto him, 'Lord, allow me first to go and bury my father.' But Jesus said unto him, 'Follow me; and let the dead bury their dead.'

And when he had entered the boat, his disciples followed him. And, behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea, so that the ship was covered by the waves: but he was asleep. And they came and awoke him, saying, 'Lord, help, we perish.' And he said unto them, 'Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?' Then he arose, and rebuked the winds and the sea; and there was a great calm. But the men marvelled, saying, 'What sort of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him!'

And when he had come to the other side, to the country of the Gergesenes, two men possessed with demons met him, coming out from the tombs, who were so violent that no man could pass by that way. And, behold, they cried out, saying, 'What have we to do with thee, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?' And a good way off from them there was an herd of many swine, feeding. So the demons besought him, saying, 'If thou cast us out, send us into the herd of swine.' And he said unto them, 'Go.' So they came out, and went into the herd of swine: and, behold, the whole herd of swine rushed down the cliff into the lake, and perished in the waters. And the swineherds fled, and went into the city, and reported everything, and also what had happened to those who were possessed by the demons. And, behold, the whole city came out to meet Jesus: and when they saw him, they besought him to depart out of their territory.

CHAPTER IX

And he entered into a boat, and crossed over, and came to his own city. And, behold, they brought to him a paralyzed man, lying on a bed: and Jesus, seeing their faith, said unto the paralyzed man: 'Son, be of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven thee.' And, behold, certain of the scribes said among themselves, 'This man blasphemes.' And Jesus perceiving their thoughts said, 'Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts? For which is easier: to say, Thy sins are forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins,'—then said he to the paralyzed man, 'Arise, take up thy bed, and go home.' And he arose, and went home. But when the crowd saw it, they were afraid, and glorified God, who had given such power unto men.

And as Jesus passed by from there, he saw a man, named Matthew, sitting at the tax house: and he said unto him, 'Follow me.' And he arose, and followed him.

And it came to pass, as Jesus sat at table in the house, behold, many tax-collectors and sinners came and sat down with him and his disciples. And when the Pharisees saw it, they said unto his disciples, 'Why does your Master eat with tax-collectors and sinners?' But when Jesus heard it, he said, 'The strong have no need of the physician, but they that are sick. But go ye and learn what it meaneth: I desire mercy, and not sacrifice: for I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.'

Then the disciples of John came to him, saying, 'Why do we and the Pharisees fast, but thy disciples fast not?' And Jesus said unto them, 'Can the wedding guests mourn, as long as the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come, when the bridegroom will be taken from them, and then they will fast. No man putteth a piece of undressed cloth on to an old garment, for, if he do, the patch draggeth away from the garment, and the rent is made worse. Neither do men pour new wine into old wine skins: for, if they do, the skins burst, and the wine runneth out, and the skins perish: but they pour new wine into new skins, and both are preserved.'

While he was speaking these words unto them, behold, a ruler came up, and fell down before him, saying, 'My daughter has just died: but come, and lay thy hand upon her, and she will live.' And Jesus arose, and followed him, with his disciples.

And, behold, a woman, who had had an issue of blood for twelve years, came behind him, and touched the tassel of his garment: for she said to herself, 'If I only touch his garment, I shall be healed.' But Jesus turned round, and saw her, and said, 'Daughter, be of good cheer; thy faith hath healed thee.' And the woman was healed from that hour.

And when Jesus came into the ruler's house, and saw the flute players and the people making an uproar, he said unto them, 'Depart: for the maiden is not dead, but sleepeth.' And they laughed him to scorn. But when the people were driven out, he went in, and took her by the hand, and the girl arose. And the report of it went out into all that land.

And when Jesus passed on from there, two blind men followed him, crying, and saying, 'Pity us, son of David.' And when he had come into the house, the blind men came to him, and Jesus said unto them, 'Have ye faith that I am able to do this?' They said unto him, 'Yes, Lord.' Then he touched their eyes, saying, 'According to your faith be it done unto you.' And their eyes were opened. And Jesus sternly charged them, saying, 'See that no man know it.' But they departed and spread abroad his fame in all that country.

As they went out, behold, there was brought to him a dumb man possessed with a demon. And when the demon was expelled, the dumb man spoke: and the crowd marvelled, saying, 'Never yet was such a thing seen in Israel.' But the Pharisees said, 'Through the prince of the demons he expels the demons.'

And Jesus went about in all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and proclaiming the Good Tidings of the kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease. But when he saw the people, he was moved with compassion for them, because they were harassed and prostrate, as sheep having no shepherd. Then said he unto his disciples, 'The harvest is large, but the labourers are few; beseech, therefore, the lord of the harvest, that he send out labourers into his harvest.'

CHAPTER X

And he called unto him his twelve disciples, and gave them power to cast out unclean spirits, and to heal every sickness and every disease. Now the names of the twelve apostles are these: first, Simon, who was called Peter, and Andrew his brother; James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother; Philip, and Bartholomew; Thomas, and Matthew the tax-collector; James the son of Alphæus, and Lebbæus; Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him.

These twelve Jesus despatched, and commanded them, saying, 'Take not your way to the heathen, and enter into no city of the Samaritans: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go, proclaim, saying, The kingdom of heaven hath drawn near. Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out demons: ye received gratis; give gratis. Provide yourselves with no gold, or silver, or brass in your girdles; with no wallet for the journey, or two coats, or shoes, or staff: for the labourer is worthy of his food. And into whatever city or village ye enter, enquire who in it is worthy; and there abide till ye go thence. And when ye come into the house, salute it. And if the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it: but if it be not worthy, let your peace return to you. And whoever shall not receive you, or hear your words, depart out of that house or city, and shake off the dust from your feet. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha on the Day of Judgment than for that city.

'Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore clever as serpents, and innocent as doves. Take heed of men: for they will deliver you up to the councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues; and ye will be brought before governors and kings for my sake, to bear witness to them and to the heathen. But when they deliver you up, be not anxious how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you. And brother shall deliver up brother unto death, and the father the child: and children shall rise up against parents, and cause them to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that endureth to the end, he shall be saved. But when they persecute you in one city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not finish the cities of Israel, before the Son of man hath come.

'A disciple is not above his master, nor a servant above his lord. It sufficeth for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they called the master of the house Beelzebul, how much more them of his household? So fear them not. For there is nothing hidden that shall not be disclosed; and concealed, that shall not be known. What I tell you in the darkness, that speak in the light: and what ye hear in your ear, that proclaim upon the housetops. And fear not them who kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell. Are not two sparrows sold for a penny? and not one of them falleth to the ground without your Father. But of you even the hairs of your head are all numbered. So fear ye not; ye are of more value than many sparrows. Whoever, then, shall acknowledge me before men, him will I too acknowledge before my Father who is in heaven. But whoever denieth me before men, him will I also deny before my Father who is in heaven.

'Think not that I came to bring peace on earth: I came not to bring peace, but a sword. For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. And a man's foes will be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. He that hath found his life shall lose it: and he that hath lost his life for my sake shall find it.

'He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me. He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward. And whoever shall give one of these little ones but a cup of cold water to drink in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward.'

CHAPTER XI

And when Jesus had finished his injunctions to his twelve disciples, he departed thence to teach and to preach in their cities.

Now when John heard in the prison the works of the Christ, he sent a message through his disciples, and said unto him, 'Art thou he who is to come, or are we to wait for another?' Jesus answered and said unto them, 'Go and report to John what ye hear and see: the blind see again, and the lame walk; the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear; the dead are raised up, and the poor receive the Good Tidings. And happy is he, who findeth no stumbling-block in me.'

And as they departed, Jesus began to say unto the people concerning John: 'Why went ye out into the wilderness? To see a reed shaken with the wind? Or why went ye out? To see a man clothed in soft raiment? behold, they that wear soft clothing are in the houses of kings. Or why went ye out? To see a prophet? yea, I say unto you, and more than a prophet. For this is he, of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee. Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist: yet he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.

'But from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven is being stormed, and the stormers seize it by force. For all the Prophets and the Law prophesied until John. And if ye are willing to receive it: this is Elijah who was to come. He that hath ears, let him hear.

'But to whom shall I liken this generation? It is like unto children sitting in the market-places who call to their companions, and say, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have made lamentation, and ye have not beaten the breast. For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He has a demon. The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a glutton and a wine-bibber, a friend of tax-collectors and sinners. But wisdom was justified by her works.'

Then began he to reproach the cities wherein most of his mighty works had been done, because they had not repented. 'Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, It shall be more endurable for Tyre and Sidon at the Day of Judgment than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which wast exalted unto heaven, shalt be thrust down unto Hades: for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. But I say unto you, That it shall be more endurable for the land of Sodom in the Day of Judgment, than for thee.'

At that time Jesus answered and said, 'I praise thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and the clever, and hast revealed them unto the simple. Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight. All was delivered unto me by my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, except the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, except the Son, and he to whom the Son would reveal him.

'Come unto me, all ye that are weary and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.'

CHAPTER XII

At that time Jesus went on the sabbath day through the cornfields; and his disciples were hungry, and began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat. But when the Pharisees saw it, they said unto him, 'Behold, thy disciples do that which it is not lawful to do upon the sabbath day.' But he said unto them, 'Have ye not read what David did, when he was hungry, and they that were with him; how he entered into the house of God, and how they ate the shewbread, which it was not lawful either for him to eat, or for them who were with him, but only for the priests? Or have ye not read in the Law, how that on the sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are guiltless? But I say unto you that what is greater than the temple is here. But if ye knew what it meaneth, I desire mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless. For the Son of man is Lord of the sabbath.'

And he departed thence, and entered their synagogue. And, behold, there was a man who had a withered hand. And they asked him, saying, 'Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath day?' so that they might accuse him. And he said unto them, 'What man would there be among you, who, if he had one sheep, and if it fell on the sabbath day into a pit, would not take hold of it, and lift it out? Now how much more precious is a man than a sheep. Wherefore it is lawful to do good on the sabbath day.' Then said he to the man, 'Stretch out thine hand.' And he stretched it out; and it was restored sound like the other one.

Then the Pharisees went out, and formed a resolution against him, to destroy him. But when Jesus became aware of this, he withdrew himself thence. And many followed him, and he healed them all. And he strictly enjoined them that they should not make him known:—that what was spoken by Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled, who said, 'Behold my servant, whom I chose; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall proclaim judgment to the nations. He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. A crushed reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he hath brought forth judgment unto victory. And in his name shall the nations trust.'

Then was brought unto him one possessed with a demon, who was blind and dumb: and he healed him, so that the dumb man spake and saw. And all the people were utterly amazed, and said, 'Is this man, perhaps, the son of David?' But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, 'This man only drives out the demons through Beelzebul the prince of the demons.' And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, 'Every kingdom divided against itself is ruined; and every city or house divided against itself cannot endure. And if Satan drive out Satan, he is divided against himself; how then can his kingdom endure? And if I by Beelzebul drive out demons, by whom do your children drive them out? therefore they shall be your judges. But if I drive out the demons by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God hath already come unto you. Or how can a man enter into a strong man's house, and plunder his goods, unless he first bind the strong man? and then he can plunder his house. He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth. Therefore I say unto you, Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven unto men. And whoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whoever speaketh against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in the world to come.

'Either hold that the tree is good, and then that its fruit is good; or hold that the tree is rotten, and then that its fruit is rotten: for the tree is known by its fruit. O offspring of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak what is good? for out of that with which the heart overfloweth the mouth speaketh. A good man out of his good store bringeth forth good: and an evil man out of his evil store bringeth forth evil. But I say unto you, That of every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account in the Day of Judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.'

Then some of the scribes and of the Pharisees answered him, saying, 'Master, we desire to see a sign from thee.' But he answered and said unto them, 'An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and no sign shall be given to it, but the sign of Jonah, the prophet. For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh shall appear as accusers of this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and, behold, more than Jonah is here. The queen of the south shall appear as accuser of this generation, and shall condemn it: for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, more than Solomon is here.

'But when the unclean spirit hath departed out of a man, it passeth through desert places, seeking rest, and findeth none. Then it saith, I will return into my house whence I departed; and when it hath entered, it findeth it empty, swept, and garnished. Then it goeth, and taketh with it seven other spirits more wicked than itself, and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that man becometh worse than the first. Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation.'

While he yet talked to the people, behold, his mother and his brothers stood without, desiring to speak with him. But he answered and said unto him that told him, 'Who is my mother? and who are my brothers?' And he stretched out his hand toward his disciples, and said, 'Behold my mother and my brothers. For whoever doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven, *he* is my brother, and sister, and mother.'

CHAPTER XIII

The same day Jesus went out of the house, and sat down by the side of the lake. And crowds of people were gathered unto him, so that he went into a boat, and sat down; and the whole crowd stood on the shore. And he spoke many things unto them in parables, saying, 'Behold, a sower went out to sow. And as he sowed, some seed fell by the way side, and the birds came and ate it up. Some fell upon stony ground, where it had not much earth: and it sprang up quickly, because it had no depth of earth. And when the sun rose up, it was scorched; and because it had no root, it withered away. And some fell among thorns; and the thorns sprang up, and choked it. But some seed fell upon good ground, and bore a crop, part an hundredfold, part sixtyfold, part thirtyfold. Who hath ears, let him hear.'

And the disciples came, and said unto him, 'Why speakest thou unto them in parables?' He answered and said unto them, 'Because to you it hath been given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it hath not been given. For whoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but whoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that which he hath. Therefore speak I to them in parables: because seeing, they see not, and, hearing, they hear not, neither do they understand. And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, which saith, Ye shall indeed hear, but ye shall not understand; and ye shall indeed see, but ye shall not perceive: for this people's heart is waxed fat, and their ears are heavy of hearing, and they have closed their eyes; lest haply they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should turn again, and I might heal them.

'But happy are *your* eyes, that they see: and *your* ears, that they hear. For verily I say unto you, Many prophets and righteous men have desired to see what ye see, and have not seen; and to hear what ye hear, and have not heard.

'Do ye, then, hear the parable of the sower. When any one heareth the Word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, then cometh the Wicked One, and snatcheth away that which was sown in his heart. This is he who was sown by the way side. But he that was, as it were, sown on stony ground, is he that heareth the Word, and immediately receiveth it with gladness. Yet hath he not root in himself, and so endureth but for a time: for when affliction or persecution ariseth because of the Word, immediately he falleth away. He that was sown among thorns is he that heareth the Word; and the care of the world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the Word, and it remaineth unfruitful. But he that was sown on good ground is he that heareth the Word, and understandeth it; he accordingly beareth a crop, and bringeth forth, now an hundredfold, now sixtyfold, now thirtyfold.'

Another parable he laid before them, saying, 'The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man who sowed good seed in his field: but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed weeds among the wheat, and went his way. But when the blade had sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the weeds also. So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field? whence then has it weeds? He said unto them, An enemy has done this. The servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? But he said, No; lest while ye gather up the weeds, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, First gather together the weeds, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but bring the wheat into my barn.'

Another parable he laid before them, saying, 'The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field. Now it is the least of all the seeds: but when it is grown, it is the greatest among plants, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof.'

Another parable spoke he unto them; 'The kingdom of heaven is like unto yeast, which a woman took, and buried in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened.'

All these things spoke Jesus unto the people in parables; and without a parable spoke he not unto them: that that might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, 'I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world.'

Then Jesus sent the people away, and went into the house. And his disciples came unto him, saying, 'Explain unto us the parable of the weeds in the field.' He answered and said unto them, 'He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the weeds are the children of the Wicked One; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the Age; and the reapers are the angels. As the weeds are gathered together and burned in the fire; so shall it be at the end of the Age. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather together out of his kingdom all those who have caused men to go astray, and doers of lawlessness; and they shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be the wailing and the gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears, let him hear.

'Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field; which a man found and concealed, and in his joy he went and sold all that he had, and bought that field.

'Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant, seeking goodly pearls: who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it.

'Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and collected fish of every kind. And when it was full, they drew it to shore, and sat down, and collected the good into vessels, but the bad they cast away. So shall it be at the end of the Age: the angels shall go forth, and sever the wicked from the righteous, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.

'Have ye understood all these things?' They said unto him, 'Yes, Lord.' Then said he unto them, 'Therefore every scribe who hath become a disciple of the kingdom of heaven is like unto a householder, who bringeth forth out of his storehouse both new things and old.'

And when Jesus had finished these parables, he departed thence. And he came into his own native city, and he taught them in their synagogue, insomuch that they were amazed, and said, 'Whence come to this man this wisdom, and the miracles? Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brothers, James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Judas? And are not also his sisters all with us? Whence then come to this man all these things?' And he was a stumbling-block unto them. But Jesus said unto them, 'A prophet is not without honour, save in his native city, and in his own home.' And he did not perform many miracles there because of their unbelief.

CHAPTER XIV

At that time Herod the tetrarch heard of the fame of Jesus and he said unto his servants, 'This is John the Baptist; he is risen from the dead; and therefore miraculous powers are active in him.'

For Herod had seized John, and bound him, and put him in prison on account of Herodias, the wife of his brother. For John had said unto him, 'It is not lawful for thee to have her.' And he would have liked to have put him to death, but he feared the people, because they counted him as a prophet. But upon Herod's birthday, the daughter of Herodias danced before them, and pleased Herod. Whereupon he promised with an oath to give her whatsoever she should ask. And she, being instigated by her mother, said, 'Give me here on a dish the head of John the Baptist.' And the king was sorry: nevertheless for the oath's sake, and for the sake of them who sat with him at table, he commanded it to be given her. So he sent, and had John beheaded in the prison. And his head was brought on a dish, and given to the girl: and she brought it to her mother. And his disciples came, and took away the corpse, and buried it, and went and told Jesus.

Now when Jesus heard of it, he departed thence by boat to a lonely place, by himself. But when the people heard of it, they followed him on foot from the cities. So when Jesus disembarked, he saw a great crowd, and he was moved with compassion toward them, and he healed their sick. And when it was evening, the disciples came to him, saying, 'This is a lonely place, and the hour is already late; send the people away, that they may go into the villages, and buy themselves food.' But Jesus said unto them, 'They need not depart; do ye give them to eat.' But they said unto him, 'We have here only five loaves and two fishes.' He said, 'Bring them hither to me.' And he bade the people sit down on the grass, and he took the five loaves, and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he said the blessing, and he broke the loaves, and gave them to his disciples, and the disciples gave them to the people. And they did all eat, and were satisfied; and they took up of the fragments that were over twelve baskets full. And they that ate were about five thousand men, beside women and children.

And straightway Jesus made his disciples get into the boat, and cross over before him to the other side, while he sent the people away. And when he had sent the people away, he went up on to the mountain, by himself, to pray. And when the evening was come, he was there alone. But the boat was then already in the middle of the lake, harassed by the waves: for the wind was against them. And in the fourth watch of the night he came unto them, walking on the lake. But when the disciples saw him walking on the lake, they were troubled, saying, 'It is a ghost'; and they cried out for fear. But straightway Jesus spake unto them, saying, 'Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid.' And Peter answered him and said, 'Lord, if it be thou, bid me come to thee upon the water.' And he said, 'Come.' So Peter stepped down from the boat, and walked upon the water, and went towards Jesus. But when he saw the wind, he was afraid; and he began to sink, and he cried out, saying, 'Lord, save me.' And immediately Jesus stretched out his hand, and took hold of him, and said unto him, 'O man of little faith, why didst thou doubt?' And when they got up into the boat, the wind dropped. Then they that were in the boat did him reverence, and said, 'Verily thou art the Son of God.'

And when they had crossed over, they came to land at Gennesaret. And the men of that place recognized him, and they sent out into all that country round about, and brought unto him all that were sick. And they besought him that they might only touch the border of his garment: and as many as touched it were healed.

CHAPTER XV

Then came to Jesus from Jerusalem some scribes and Pharisees, saying, 'Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread.' But he answered and said unto them, 'Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God because of your tradition? For God commanded, saying, Honour thy father and thy mother: and, He that revileth father or mother, let him die the death. But ye say, Whosoever sayeth to his father or his mother, That by which thou mightest have been benefited from me is Corban,'—(that is, an offering,)—'he shall not honour his father or his mother. Thus have ye made the commandment of God void because of your tradition. Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying, This people honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. And vainly do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the commandments of men.'

And he called the people unto him, and said unto them, 'Hear and understand: not that which goeth into the mouth maketh a man unclean; but that which cometh out of the mouth, this maketh a man unclean.'

Then came his disciples, and said unto him, 'Knowest thou that the Pharisees were offended when they heard this saying?' But he answered and said, 'Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up. Let them alone: they are blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both will fall into the ditch.' Then answered Peter and said unto him, 'Explain the parable to us.' And Jesus said, 'Are ye too still without understanding? Do ye not understand, that whatever entereth into the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the privy? But those things which issue from the mouth come forth from the heart; and these make a man unclean. For out of the heart come evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, unchastity, thefts, false witness, blasphemies. These are the things which make a man unclean: but to eat with unwashed hands doth not make a man unclean.'

Then Jesus departed thence, and withdrew to the district of Tyre and Sidon. And, behold, a Canaanite woman came out from that region, and cried out, saying, 'Pity me, Lord, son of David; my daughter is grievously possessed with a demon.' But he answered her not a word. And his disciples came and besought him, saying, 'Send her away; for she keeps crying out behind us.' But he answered and said, 'I am not sent except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' Then came she and did him reverence saying, 'Lord, help me.' But he answered and said, 'It is not lawful to take the children's bread, and to throw it to the dogs.' And she said, 'Yes, Lord: for also the dogs eat of the morsels which fall from their masters' table.' Then Jesus answered and said unto her, 'O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou desirest.' And her daughter was healed from that hour.

And Jesus departed thence, and came to the lake of Galilee. And he went up on to the mountain, and sat down there. And great crowds came unto him, having with them those that were lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and they cast them down at Jesus's feet; and he healed them: so that the crowd marvelled to see how the dumb spoke, the maimed became sound, the lame walked, and the blind saw: and they glorified the God of Israel.

Then Jesus called his disciples unto him, and said, 'I feel pity for the people, because they have tarried with me now three days, and have nothing to eat: and I do not wish to send them away fasting, lest they faint by the way.' And his disciples said unto him, 'Whence could we get so much bread in the wilderness, so as to satisfy so great a crowd?' And Jesus said unto them, 'How many loaves have ye?' And they said, 'Seven, and a few small fishes.' And he bade the people sit down on the ground. And he took the seven loaves and the fishes, and spoke the blessing, and broke them, and gave them to his disciples, and the disciples gave them to the people. And they all ate, and were satisfied: and they took up of the broken bits that were left seven baskets full. And they that ate were four thousand men, beside women and children. Then he sent the people away, and went into the boat, and came into the district of Magdala.

CHAPTER XVI

Then the Pharisees and the Sadducees came, and demanded him to show them a sign from heaven in order to tempt him. But he answered and said unto them, '[In the evening, ye say, It will be fair weather: for the sky is red. And in the morning, It will be stormy weather to-day: for the sky is red and overcast. Ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?] A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and no sign shall be given unto it, except the sign of Jonah.' And he left them, and departed.

And the disciples came across to the other side, and forgot to take with them bread. Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.' And they argued in themselves, saying, 'It is because we have taken no bread.' But Jesus knew their thoughts, and he said unto them, 'O ye of little faith, why argue ye in yourselves, It is because we have brought no bread? Do ye not yet understand, and do ye not remember the five loaves of the five thousand, and how many baskets ye took up? or the seven loaves of the four thousand, and how many baskets ye took up? How is it that ye do not understand that I spoke not to you concerning bread? But beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.' Then they understood how that he bade them beware, not of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.

Then Jesus came into the district of Cæsarea Philippi. And he asked his disciples, saying, 'Whom do men say that the Son of man is?' And they said, 'Some say John the Baptist: some Elijah; and others Jeremiah, or one of the prophets.' He said unto them, 'But ye—whom say ye that I am?' And Simon Peter answered and said, 'Thou art the Messiah, the Son of the living God.'

And Jesus answered and said unto him, 'Happy art thou, Simon Bar-jonah: for flesh and blood revealed it not unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven. So I say also unto thee: Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatever thou bindest on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatever thou loosest on earth shall be loosed in heaven.'

Then he enjoined his disciples that they should tell no one that he was the Messiah.

From that time began Jesus to show unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer much from the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and on the third day be raised. Then Peter took him aside, and began to rebuke him, saying, 'God forbid, Lord; this shall never befall thee.' But he turned, and said unto Peter, 'Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art a stumbling-block unto me: for thou thinkest not the thoughts of God, but of men.'

Then said Jesus unto his disciples, 'If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whoever would save his life shall lose it: and whoever would lose his life for my sake shall find it. For what shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and forfeit his life? or what shall a man give as the price of his life? For the Son of man is about to come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then will he render to every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, There are some of those standing here, who shall not taste death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.'

CHAPTER XVII

And after six days Jesus took Peter, James, and John his brother, and brought them up on to an high mountain by themselves. And he was transfigured before them: and his face shone as the sun, and his raiment became white as the light. And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elijah talking with him. Then Peter answered and said unto Jesus, 'Lord, it is good for us to be here: if thou wilt, I will make here three tents; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah.' While he yet spoke, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold, a voice out of the cloud, saying, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.' And when the disciples heard it, they fell upon their faces, and were sore afraid. And Jesus came and touched them, and said, 'Arise, and be not afraid.' And when they had lifted up their eyes, they saw nobody except Jesus only.

And as they came down from the mountain, Jesus enjoined them, saying, 'Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man hath risen again from the dead.'

And the disciples asked him, saying, 'Why then say the scribes that Elijah must first come?' And Jesus answered and said unto them, 'Elijah cometh and putteth all things in order. But I say unto you, Elijah hath come already, and they did not recognize him, but they did unto him whatever they pleased. So also is the Son of man about to suffer from them.' Then the disciples understood that he spoke unto them of John the Baptist.

And when they returned to the people, a man came up and knelt down before him saying, 'Lord, have pity on my son: for he is moonstruck and suffers sorely: for often he falls into the fire, and often into the water. And I brought him to thy disciples, and they could not cure him.' Then Jesus answered and said, 'O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I bear with you? bring him hither to me.' And Jesus rebuked the demon; and it departed out of him: and the child was cured from that hour.

Then came the disciples to Jesus privately, and said, 'Why could not *we* cast it out?' And Jesus said unto them, 'Because of your little faith: for verily I say unto you, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye could say unto this mountain, Move from this place to that, and it would move; and nothing would be impossible unto you.'

And while they were journeying in Galilee, Jesus said unto them, 'The Son of man is about to be delivered up into the hands of men: and they will kill him, and on the third day he will rise.' And they were exceedingly grieved.

And when they came to Capernaum, they who collected the temple tax came to Peter, and said, 'Does not your master pay the tax?' He said, 'Yes.' And when he had come into the house, Jesus anticipated him, saying, 'What thinkest thou, Simon? from whom do the kings of the earth collect toll or tax? From their own children, or from strangers?' Peter said unto him, 'From strangers.' Jesus said unto him, 'Then are the children free. Yet, so that we give them no offence, go thou to the lake, and throw out thy line, and take up the fish that first comes up; open its mouth, and thou wilt find therein a coin; that take, and give it unto them for me and thee.'

CHAPTER XVIII

At that time the disciples came unto Jesus, saying, 'Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?' And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them. And he said, 'Verily I say unto you, Except ye turn, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whoever then shall humble himself as this little child, he is greatest in the kingdom of heaven. And whoever receiveth one such little child in my name receiveth me. But whoever causeth one of these little ones who believe in me to stumble, it were better for him that a millstone were hung about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.

'Woe unto the world because of the stumbling-blocks! for the stumbling-blocks must needs come; but woe to the man by whom the stumbling-block cometh! But if thy hand or thy foot cause thee to stumble, cut it off, and throw it away from thee: it is better for thee to enter into Life maimed or lame, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire. And if thine eye cause thee to stumble, pluck it out, and throw it away from thee: it is better for thee to enter into Life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire.

'Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that their angels in heaven always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven. What think ye? if a man have an hundred sheep, and one of them goeth astray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine upon the mountains, and go and seek the one which hath gone astray? And if so be that he find it, verily I say unto you, he rejoiceth more over that one sheep, than over the ninety and nine which went not astray. Even so it is not the will of your Father who is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish.

'But if thy brother have sinned, go and reprove him between thee and him alone: if he hearken to thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he hearken not, take with thee one or two more, that by the mouth of two or three witnesses every matter may be established. And if he refuse to hearken unto them, tell it unto the church: but if he refuse to hearken even unto the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen and a tax-collector. Verily I say unto you, Whatever ye bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatever ye loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Furthermore I say unto you, If two of you on earth shall agree about any thing that they ask, it shall be given them from my Father who is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in my name, I am in the midst of them.'

Then came Peter to him, and said, 'Lord, how often shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? till seven times?' Jesus said unto him, 'I say not unto thee, Until seven times: but, Until seventy times seven.

'Therefore the kingdom of heaven is likened unto a king, who desired to settle accounts with his servants. And when he began the settlement, one was brought to him, who owed him ten thousand talents. And as he was unable to pay, the lord commanded him to be sold, and his wife, and children, and all that he had, so that payment should be made. Then the servant fell down, and did him reverence, saying, Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. Then the lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and he loosed him, and forgave him the debt. But the same servant, when he went out, found one of his fellow-servants, who owed him an hundred shillings, and he seized him, and took him by the throat, saying, Pay me what thou owest. And his fellow-servant fell down, and besought him, saying, Have patience with me, and I will pay thee. Yet he would not: but he went away and cast him into prison, till he should pay the debt. So when his fellow-servants saw what was happening, they were very grieved, and they came and related unto their lord all that had happened. Then his lord called him unto him and said to him, O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou besoughtest me: shouldest not thou also have had pity on thy fellow-servant, even as I had pity on thee? And his lord in his wrath delivered him up to the torturers, till he should pay all that was due unto him. So also will my heavenly Father do unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother.'

CHAPTER XIX

And it came to pass, that when Jesus had finished these sayings, he departed from Galilee, and came into the district of Judæa beyond the Jordan; and great crowds followed him; and he healed them there.

And some Pharisees came unto him, to test him, saying unto him, 'Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife for every cause?' And he answered and said unto them, 'Have ye not read, that the Creator made them from the beginning male and female, and said, For this reason shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What then God hath joined together, let not man separate.'

They said unto him, 'Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorce, and to send her away?' He said unto them, 'Because of the hardness of your hearts Moses permitted you to divorce your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, whoever divorceth his wife, except for unchastity, and marrieth another, committeth adultery.'

His disciples said unto him, 'If such is the position of a man to his wife, it is not desirable to marry.' But he said unto them, 'All men cannot receive this saying, but only they to whom it is given. For there are eunuchs, who were born so from their mother's womb: and there are eunuchs, who were made eunuchs by men: and there are eunuchs, who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.'

Then were there brought unto him little children, that he should put his hands on them, and pray: and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said, 'Permit the little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven.' And he laid his hands on them, and departed thence.

And, behold, one came up to him and said, 'Master, what good shall I do, that I may obtain eternal life?' And he said unto him, 'Why askest thou me about the good? One is the good: but if thou desirest to enter into Life, keep the commandments.' He said unto him, 'Which?' Jesus said, 'Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' The young man said unto him, 'All these things have I observed: what lack I yet?' Jesus said unto him, 'If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell thy goods, and give them to the poor, and thou shalt obtain treasure in heaven: and come, follow me.' But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions.

Then said Jesus unto his disciples, 'Verily I say unto you, A rich man shall with difficulty enter the kingdom of heaven. And again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God.' But when the disciples heard that, they were greatly appalled, saying, 'Who then can be saved?' But Jesus looked at them, and said, 'With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible.'

Then answered Peter and said unto him, 'Lo, *we* have abandoned all, and followed thee; what then will be ours?' And Jesus said unto them, 'Verily I say unto you, At the New Birth, when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye who have followed me shall also sit yourselves upon twelve thrones, ruling the twelve tribes of Israel. And every one that hath abandoned house, or brothers, or sisters, or father, or mother, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life. But many that are now first shall be last; and the last first.'

CHAPTER XX

'For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a householder, who went out early in the morning to hire labourers for his vineyard. And when he had agreed with the labourers for a shilling a day, he sent them into his vineyard. And he went out about the third hour, and saw others standing idle in the marketplace, and he said unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard, and whatever is right I will give you. So they went. Again he went out about the sixth and ninth hour, and did the same as before. And about the eleventh hour he went out, and found others standing about, and said unto them, Why stand ye here all the day idle? They said unto him, Because no man has hired us. He said unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard; and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive. But when the evening had come, the lord of the vineyard said unto his steward, Call the labourers, and pay them their hire, beginning from the last unto the first. And when they came that were hired about the eleventh hour, they received every man a shilling. But when the first came, they supposed that they would receive more; yet they likewise received every man a shilling. So when they received it, they murmured against the master of the house, saying, These last have worked but one hour, and thou hast made them equal unto us, who have borne the burden and heat of the day. But he answered one of them, and said, Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst not thou agree with me for a shilling? Take what is thine, and go thy way: I like to give unto this last, even as unto thee. Have I not the right to do what I like with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good? So the last shall be first, and the first last.'

And as Jesus was going up to Jerusalem, he took the Twelve aside privately, and said unto them, 'Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man will be delivered up to the chief priests and the scribes, and they will condemn him to death. And they will deliver him up to the heathen to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him: and on the third day he will rise.'

Then came to him the mother of the sons of Zebedee with her sons, doing him reverence, and petitioning him. And he said unto her, 'What dost thou want?' She said unto him, 'Say that these my two sons shall sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left, in thy kingdom.' But Jesus answered and said, 'Ye know not what ye ask. Can ye drink of the cup that I am about to drink of?' They said unto him, 'We can.' And he said unto them, 'Ye shall drink indeed of my cup: but to sit on my right hand and on my left, this is not mine to give, but it shall be for them for whom it is prepared by my Father.'

And when the ten heard it, they were indignant against the two brothers. But Jesus called them unto him, and said, 'Ye know that they who rule over the nations lord it over them, and their great ones play the tyrant over them. But it shall not be so among you: but whoever wisheth to become great among you, let him be your servant; and whoever would be first among you, let him be your slave. Even as the Son of man came not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many.'

And as they departed from Jericho, a great crowd followed him. And, behold, two blind men sitting by the way side, when they heard that Jesus was passing by, cried out, saying, 'Have pity on us, son of David.' And the crowd rebuked them, that they should hold their peace: but they cried the more loudly, saying, 'Have pity on us, son of David.' And Jesus stood still, and called them, and said, 'What do ye wish that I should do unto you?' They said unto him, 'Lord, that our eyes may be opened.' Then Jesus was moved with compassion, and touched their eyes: and immediately they received their sight again, and they followed him.

CHAPTER XXI

And when they drew nigh unto Jerusalem, and had come to Bethphage, unto the mount of Olives, then Jesus sent forth two disciples, saying unto them, 'Go into the village before you, and straightway ye will find an ass tied, and a colt with her: loose them, and bring them unto me. And if any man say ought unto you, ye shall say, The Lord has need of them; and straightway he will send them.'

All this happened, that that might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, 'Tell ye the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, gentle and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of a beast of burden.'

And the disciples went, and did as Jesus had commanded them. And they brought the ass and the colt, and put garments upon them, and he sat on them. And most of the crowd spread their garments on the way, while others cut down branches from the trees, and spread them on the way. And the crowds, both they that went before him, and they that followed him, kept crying out, 'Hosanna to the son of David: blessed in the name of the Lord is he that cometh. Hosanna in the heights.'

And when he was come into Jerusalem, all the city was excited, saying, 'Who is this?' And the crowds said, 'This is the prophet Jesus from Nazareth in Galilee.'

And Jesus went into the temple, and drove out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and the seats of them that sold doves. And he said unto them, 'It is written, My house shall be called a house of prayer; but ye make it a den of thieves.'

And blind and lame folk came to him in the temple; and he healed them. And when the chief priests and scribes saw the wonderful things that he did, and the children crying out in the temple, and saying, 'Hosanna to the son of David,' they were indignant. And they said unto him, 'Hearest thou what these say?' And Jesus said unto them, 'Yes; have ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast prepared praise'?

And he left them, and went out of the city into Bethany; and he passed the night there. Now in the morning, as he returned into the city, he was hungry. And seeing a fig tree by the wayside, he went up to it, but found nothing on it except leaves. And he said unto it, 'No more shall fruit come from thee for ever.' And immediately the fig tree withered away. And when the disciples saw it, they marvelled, saying, 'How instantly the fig tree withered away!' Jesus answered and said unto them, 'Verily I say unto you, If ye have faith, and doubt not, ye shall not only do what has been done to the fig tree, but also if ye should say unto this mountain, Lift thyself up, and hurl thyself into the sea, it would come to pass. And all things whatever that ye ask for in prayer, if ye have faith, ye shall receive.'

And when he had come into the temple, the chief priests and the Elders of the people came up to him as he was teaching, and said, 'By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority?' And Jesus answered and said unto them, 'I also will ask you one question, which if ye tell me, I too will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or from men?' And they argued with themselves, saying, 'If we say, From heaven, he will say unto us, Why then did ye not believe him? But if we say, From men, we fear the people; for they all hold John to be a prophet.' So they answered Jesus, and said, 'We do not know.' And he said unto them, 'Neither do I tell you by what authority I do these things.

'But what think ye? A man had two sons; and he came to the first, and said, Son, go and work to-day in the vineyard. He answered and said, I will not: but afterwards he repented, and went. And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he answered and said, I go, sir; but he went not. Which of the two did the will of his father?' They said unto him, 'The first.' Jesus said unto them, 'Verily I say unto you, The tax-collectors and the harlots go before you into the kingdom of God. For John brought unto you the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not: but the tax-collectors and the harlots believed him: and ye, though ye saw it, repented not afterwards, so as to believe him.

'Hear another parable: There was a householder, who planted a vineyard, and set an hedge around it, and dug out a winepress in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went abroad. And when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen to receive the fruits of it. And the husbandmen seized his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another. Again, he sent other servants, more in number than the first: and they treated them in the same way. But later still he sent unto them his son, saying, They will have respect for my son. But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and seize his inheritance. And they laid hold of him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him. When then the lord of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen?' They said unto him, 'He will put those wicked men to an evil death, and the vineyard he will let out unto other husbandmen, who will pay him the fruits in their seasons.' Jesus said unto them, 'Have ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected is become the corner-stone: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes? Therefore I say unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth its fruits.'

And when the chief priests and Pharisees heard his parables, they realized that he spoke of them. And they sought to take him prisoner, but they feared the people, because they regarded him as a prophet.

CHAPTER XXII

And Jesus answered and spake unto them again in parables, saying, 'The kingdom of heaven is like unto a king, who made a marriage-feast for his son. And he sent forth his servants to call those who had been invited to the marriage-feast: and they would not come. Again, he sent forth other servants, saying, Tell them who have been invited, Behold, I have prepared my dinner: my oxen and my fatlings are killed, and all is ready: come unto the marriage-feast. But they gave no heed, and went away, one to his field, another to his business. And the rest seized his servants, and ill-treated them, and slew them. But the king was wroth: and he sent forth his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned their city. Then said he to his servants, The marriage-feast is ready, but they who were invited were not worthy. Go ye, then, to the cross-roads, and whomever ye find, invite to the marriage-feast. So those servants went out into the highways, and collected all whom they found, both bad and good; and the marriage hall was filled with guests. And when the king came in to look at the guests, he saw there a man who was not clad with a wedding garment: and he said unto him, Friend, how camest thou in hither without a wedding garment? But he was speechless. Then said the king to the servants, Bind him hand and foot, and cast him into the outer darkness; there shall the weeping be and the gnashing of teeth. For many are invited, but few are chosen.'

Then went the Pharisees, and formed a resolution that they would entrap him in his talk. And they sent unto him their disciples with the Herodians, saying, 'Master, we know that thou art truthful, and teachest the way of God in truth, and that thou hast regard for no man: for thou respectest not the person of men. So tell us: What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto the Emperor, or not?' But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, 'Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? Show me the tribute money.' And they brought unto him a silver coin. And he said unto them, 'Whose is this image and superscription?' They said unto him, 'The Emperor's.' Then said he unto them, 'Pay, then, to the Emperor what is the Emperor's, and unto God what is God's.' When they had heard this, they marvelled, and left him, and went their way.

The same day there came to him some Sadducees, who say that there is no resurrection, and they asked him, saying, 'Master, Moses said, If a man die, having no children, his brother must marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. Now there were among us seven brothers: and the first married and died, and, having no issue, left his wife unto his brother: so too the second and the third, unto the seventh. And last of all the woman died. In the resurrection, then, whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her.' Jesus answered and said unto them 'Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures or the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as angels of God in heaven. But as regards the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? He is not the God of the dead, but of the living.' And when the people heard this, they were astounded at his teaching.

But when the Pharisees heard that he had put the Sadducees to silence, they gathered together. Then one of them, a teacher of the Law, tempting him, asked him: 'Master, which is the great commandment in the Law?' Jesus said unto him, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang the whole Law and the Prophets.'

While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them saying, 'What think ye about the Messiah? whose son is he?' They said unto him, 'David's.' He said unto them, 'How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If, then, David call him Lord, how is he his son?' And no man was able to answer him a word, neither did anyone from that day venture to question him again.

CHAPTER XXIII

Then spoke Jesus to the people, and to his disciples, saying, 'The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all, then, that they say to you, that do and observe; but do not do according to their works: for they say, and do not. For they bind heavy burdens, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers. They do all their works to be seen of men: for they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the tassels. And they love the first places at banquets, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the market-places, and to be called by men, Rabbi. But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, and ye are all brothers. And call no man your father upon earth: for one is your Father, who is in heaven. [Neither be ye called leaders: for one is your Leader, even the Christ.] But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted.

'But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, nor allow them that would enter to go in.

'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pass over sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he becometh one, ye make him a child of hell twice as much as yourselves.

'Woe unto you, blind guides, who say, Whoever sweareth by the temple, it is nothing; but whoever sweareth by the gold of the temple, he is bound by his oath. Fools and blind! for which is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold? And (ye say) Whoever sweareth by the altar, it is nothing; but whoever sweareth by the sacrifice that is upon it, he is bound by his oath. Fools and blind! for which is greater, the sacrifice, or the altar that sanctifieth the sacrifice? Who therefore sweareth by the altar, sweareth by it, and by all that is on it. And who sweareth by the temple, sweareth by it, and by Him that dwelleth in it. And he that sweareth by heaven, sweareth by the throne of God, and by Him that sitteth upon it.

'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe from mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightiest things of the Law, justice, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to do, though not to leave the others undone. Blind guides, who strain out a gnat, and swallow a camel.

'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye clean the outside of the cup and of the plate, but within they are full of extortion and incontinence. Blind Pharisee, clean first that which is within the cup, that the outside of it may become clean also.

'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which outwardly appear beautiful, but within are full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye too outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness.

'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and adorn the sepulchres of the righteous. And ye say, If we had lived in the days of our fathers, we should not have been partners with them in the blood of the prophets. So that ye witness unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them who killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Serpents, offspring of vipers, how can ye escape from being condemned unto hell?

'Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: some of them ye will kill and crucify; and some of them ye will scourge in your synagogues, and pursue them from city to city: so that upon you may come all the righteous blood which hath been shed upon the land from the blood of Abel the righteous unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation.

'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killest the prophets, and stonest them who are sent unto thee, how often have I desired to gather thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her brood under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed in the name of the Lord is he that cometh.'

CHAPTER XXIV

And Jesus left the temple, and went on his way, and his disciples came to him to show him the buildings of the temple. And he answered and said unto them, 'See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, which shall not be thrown down.'

And as he sat upon the mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, 'Tell us, when will these things be? and what will be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the Age?' And Jesus answered and said unto them, 'Take heed that no one lead you astray. For many will come in my name, saying, I am the Messiah; and they will lead many astray. And ye will hear of wars and rumours of wars: see that ye be not alarmed: for these things must happen, but the End is not yet. For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom:

and there will be famines and earthquakes in divers places. All these are the beginning of the Pangs.

'Then will they deliver you up to affliction; and they will kill you: and ye will be hated by all nations for my name's sake. And then many will stumble, and betray one another, and hate one another. And many false prophets will rise, and lead many astray. And because lawlessness will increase, the love of many will grow cold. But he that endureth unto the End, he shall be saved. And this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then will the End come.

'When then ye see the Abomination of Desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place, (let him that readeth give heed:) then let them who be in Judæa flee to the mountains: let him who is on the roof not go down to take any thing out of his house: neither let him who is in the field return to fetch his cloak. And woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days! But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath: for then will be great affliction such as hath not been from the beginning of the world until now, and will not be again. And if those days were not shortened, no flesh would be saved: but for the elect's sake those days will be shortened.

'Then if any man say unto you, Lo, here is the Messiah, or there; believe him not. For there will arise false Messiahs, and false prophets, and they will show great signs and wonders; so that, if it were possible, even the elect would be led astray. Behold, I have foretold you.

'If, then, they say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert, go not forth: or, behold, he is in the inner chambers, believe it not. For as the lightning cometh forth from the east, and flasheth unto the west; so shall the coming of the Son of man be. For wherever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together.

'But immediately after the affliction of those days the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give her light, and the stars will fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens will be shaken: and then the sign of the Son of man will appear in heaven: and then all the tribes of the earth will mourn, and they will see the

Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he will send out his angels with a great trumpet, and they will gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.

'Now learn a parable from the fig tree: When its branch becometh soft, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is near: so too ye, when ye see all these things, know that he is near, even at the door.

'Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away till all these things shall have taken place. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. But of that day and hour no one knoweth, not even the angels of heaven, and not even the Son, but only the Father.

'But as the days of Noah so shall the coming of the Son of man be. For as in the days that were before the flood they kept on eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and perceived nothing until the flood came, and swept them all away; so also shall the coming of the Son of man be. Then there will be two men in a field; the one will be taken, and the other left. Two women will be grinding at the mill; the one will be taken, and the other left.

'Watch therefore: for ye know not on what day your Lord may come. But know this, that if the master of the house had known at what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have permitted his house to be broken into. Therefore be ye also ready: for at an hour when ye do not expect it, the Son of man will come.

'Who, then, is the faithful and prudent servant, whom his lord hath set over his household, to give them their food in due season? Happy is that servant, whom his lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing. Verily I say unto you that he will set him over all his possessions. But if the evil servant say in his heart, My lord tarrieth long, and if he begin to beat his fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with drunkards, the lord of that servant will come on a day when he looketh not for him, and at an hour which he doth not know. And he will cut him asunder, and appoint his portion with the hypocrites: there shall the weeping be and the gnashing of teeth.'

CHAPTER XXV

'Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, who took their lamps, and went out to meet the bridegroom. And five of them were foolish, and five were wise. For the foolish took their lamps, but took no oil with them: but the wise took oil in vessels with their lamps. Now as the bridegroom tarried, they all grew drowsy and went to sleep. And at midnight a cry arose, Behold, the bridegroom! Go out to meet him. Then all those virgins got up, and trimmed their lamps. And the foolish said unto the wise, Give us some of your oil; for our lamps are gone out. But the wise answered, saying, There may not be enough for us and for you: go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves. And while they went to buy, the bridegroom arrived: and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage-feast: and the door was shut. Afterwards the other virgins came up also, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. But he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not.

'Watch therefore, for ye know not the day or the hour.

'For it is like a man going abroad, who called his servants, and delivered unto them his property. And unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; to every man according to his capacity. Then he departed. Then he that had received the five talents straightway went and traded with them, and made five talents more. And likewise he that had received two, he also gained two more. But he that had received one went and dug in the earth, and hid his lord's money.

'After a long time the lord of those servants came back, and settled accounts with them. Then he that had received the five talents came and brought the other five talents, saying, Lord, thou didst deliver unto me five talents: behold, I have gained beside them five talents more. His lord said unto him, Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful in respect of little, I will set thee over much: enter thou into the joy of thy lord. He that had received two talents came also and said, Lord, thou didst deliver unto me two talents: behold, I have gained two other talents beside them. His lord said unto him, Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful in respect of little, I will set thee over much: enter thou into the joy of thy lord. Then he who had received the one talent came and said, Lord, I knew that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not winnowed. And I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth; lo, here thou hast what is thine. His lord answered and said unto him, Thou wicked and slothful servant; didst thou know that I reap where I have not sown, and gather where I have not winnowed? Then oughtest thou to have put my money with the bankers, and then at my return I should have received mine own with interest. Take therefore the talent from him, and give it unto him who hath the ten talents. For unto everyone that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath. And cast ye the useless servant into the outer darkness: there shall the weeping be and the gnashing of teeth.

'When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him will be gathered all nations: and he will separate them one from another, as a shepherd separateth the sheep from the goats: and he will set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was hungry, and ye gave me to eat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came to me. Then the righteous will answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee hungry, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came to thee? And the King will answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, whatever ye have done unto one of these my humblest brethren, ye have done unto me. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye accursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: for I was hungry, and ye gave me not to eat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then will they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee hungry, or thirsty, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then will he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, whatever ye did not to one of these humblest, ye did not to me. And these shall depart to everlasting punishment: but the righteous to everlasting life.'

CHAPTER XXVI

And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished all these words, he said unto his disciples, 'Ye know that after two days is the passover, and the Son of man is to be delivered up to be crucified.'

Then the chief priests, and the Elders of the people, assembled together at the palace of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas, and they determined to seize Jesus by craft, and to kill him. But they said, 'Not during the festival, lest there be an uproar among the people.'

Now when Jesus was in Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper, there came unto him a woman having an alabaster cruse of very precious ointment, and poured it on his head as he sat at table. But when his disciples saw it, they were indignant, saying, 'Wherefore this waste? For this ointment might have been sold for a large sum, and given to the poor.' But when Jesus perceived it, he said unto them, 'Why vex ye the woman? for she has wrought a good deed towards me. For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always. For when she poured this ointment on my body, she did it for my burial. Verily I say unto you, Wherever this Gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that which she has done shall also be spoken of in her memory.'

Then one of the Twelve, called Judas Iscariot, went unto the chief priests, and said unto them, 'What are ye willing to give me, if I betray him unto you?' And they weighed out to him thirty pieces of silver. And from that time he sought a good opportunity to betray him.

And on the first day of the unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him, 'Where wouldst thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover?' And he said, 'Go into the city to such a man, and say unto him, The Master says, My time is nigh; I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples.' And the disciples did as Jesus had bidden them; and they prepared the passover.

So when the evening had come, he sat at table with the Twelve. And as they ate he said, 'Verily I say unto you, that one of you will betray me.' And they were deeply grieved, and began one after the other to say unto him, 'Lord, surely not I?' And he answered and said, 'He that dipped his hand with me in the dish, he will betray me. The Son of man departeth as it is written of him: but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! Better were it for that man if he had not been born.' Then Judas, who betrayed him, answered and said, 'Master, surely not I?' He said unto him, 'Thou hast said.'

And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and said the blessing, and broke it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, 'Take, eat; this is my body.' And he took a cup, and spake the blessing, and gave it to them, saying, 'Drink ye all from it; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many for the forgiveness of sins. I say unto you, I shall surely not drink from now of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in the kingdom of my Father.'

And after they had sung the *Hallel*, they went out to the mount of Olives. Then said Jesus unto them, 'Ye will all stumble because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock will be scattered. But after I have risen, I will go before you to Galilee.' Peter answered and said unto him, 'Though all shall stumble because of thee, yet will I never stumble.' Jesus said unto him, 'Verily I say unto thee, This night, before the cock crow, thou wilt deny me thrice.' Peter said unto him, 'Even if I must die with thee, I will not deny thee.' So also said all the disciples.

Then Jesus came with them unto a place called Gethsemane, and he said unto the disciples, 'Sit ye here, while I go yonder and pray.' And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and troubled. Then said he unto them, 'My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death:

tarry ye here, and watch with me.' And he went a little farther, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, 'My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt.' And he came unto the disciples, and found them sleeping, and he said unto Peter, 'So ye could not watch with me one hour? Watch and pray, that ye come not into temptation: the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak.' And again he went away, and prayed, saying, 'My Father, if this cannot pass away unless I drink it, thy will be done.' And he came and found them asleep again: for their eyes were heavy. And he left them, and went away again, and prayed the third time, saying the same words. Then he came to his disciples, and said unto them, 'Sleep ye still and take your rest? Behold, the hour hath drawn nigh, and the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. Rise up, let us go: lo, he that betrayeth me is at hand.'

And while he yet spoke, lo, Judas, one of the Twelve, came, and with him a great band with swords and bludgeons from the chief priests and Elders of the people. Now his betrayer had given them a sign, saying, 'Whomever I kiss, that is he: seize him.' And forthwith he went up to Jesus, and said, 'Hail, master'; and kissed him. And Jesus said unto him, 'Friend, that for which thou art here, do.' Then came they, and laid hands on Jesus, and seized him. And, behold, one of them who were with Jesus stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and struck the servant of the high priest, and cut off his ear. Then said Jesus unto him, 'Put back thy sword into its place: for all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword. Thinkest thou that I cannot now beseech my Father, and he would straightway give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then should the scriptures be fulfilled, that so it must be?' In that same hour said Jesus to the band, 'Have ye come out to capture me with swords and bludgeons, as if against a thief? I sat daily teaching in the temple, and ye seized me not. But all this hath happened that the writings of the prophets might be fulfilled.' Then all the disciples forsook him, and fled.

And they that had seized Jesus led him away to Caiaphas the high priest, where the scribes and the Elders were assembled.

But Peter followed from a distance unto the high priest's palace, and he went in, and sat with the servants, to see the end.

Now the chief priests, and all the high court, sought false witness against Jesus, that they might put him to death. But they found none, though many false witnesses came forward. But at last two men came forward, and said, 'This man said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it after three days.' And the high priest arose, and said unto him, 'Answerest thou nothing to that which these bear witness against thee?' But Jesus held his peace. And the high priest answered and said unto him, 'I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou art the Messiah, the Son of God.' Jesus said unto him, 'Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Soon shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of the Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven.' Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, 'He has blasphemed; what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard the blasphemy. What think ye?' They answered and said, 'He is guilty of death.'

Then they spat on his face, and struck him with their fists, and others smote him with sticks, saying, 'Prophesy unto us, O Messiah, Who is it that struck thee?'

Now Peter sat outside in the courtyard; and a maid came up to him, saying, 'Thou too wast with Jesus of Galilee.' But he denied it before them all, saying, 'I know not what thou sayest.' And as he went out to the gate, another maid saw him, and said unto them that were there, 'This man was with Jesus of Nazareth.' And again he denied it with an oath, saying, 'I do not know the man.' And after a little while the bystanders came up, and said to Peter, 'Surely thou too art one of them; for thy speech betrays thee.' Then began he to curse and to swear, saying, 'I know not the man.' And immediately the cock crew. And Peter remembered the word which Jesus had said unto him, 'Before the cock crow, thou wilt deny me thrice.' And he went out, and wept bitterly.

CHAPTER XXVII

Now in the early morning all the chief priests and Elders of the people formed their decision against Jesus to put him to death. And having bound him, they led him away, and delivered him up to Pilate the governor.

Then Judas, who had betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented, and brought the thirty pieces of silver back to the chief priests and Elders, saying, 'I have sinned by betraying innocent blood.' And they said, 'What is that to us? see to that thyself.' And he threw the pieces of silver into the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself. And the chief priests took the silver pieces, and said, 'It is not lawful to put them into the treasury, because they are the price of blood.' So they formed a resolution, and bought with them the potter's field, for the burial of strangers. Wherefore that field was called, The field of blood, unto this day. Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremiah the prophet, saying, 'And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of the prized one on whom they set a price, from the children of Israel, and I gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord commanded me.'

And Jesus stood before the governor: and the governor asked him, saying, 'Art thou the King of the Jews?' And Jesus said unto him, 'Thou sayest.' And when he was accused by the chief priests and Elders, he answered nothing. Then said Pilate unto him, 'Hearest thou not how many things they bear witness against thee?' But he did not answer even one of his words, so that the governor marvelled greatly.

Now at the festival the governor was wont to release unto the people any one prisoner, whom they wished. And there was then a notable prisoner, called Barabbas. So when they were gathered together, Pilate said unto them, 'Whom do ye wish me to release to you? Barabbas, or Jesus who is called Messiah?' For he realized that they had delivered him up out of envy.

And while he was sitting on the judgment seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, 'Have thou nothing to do with that righteous man: for I have suffered much to-day in a dream because of him.'

But the chief priests and Elders persuaded the people that they should ask for Barabbas, and let Jesus perish. So the governor answered and said unto them, 'Which of the two do ye wish me to release to you?' They said, 'Barabbas.' Pilate said unto them, 'What shall I do then with Jesus who is called Messiah?' They all said unto him, 'Let him be crucified.' And the governor said, 'Why, what evil has he done?' But they cried out the more vehemently, saying, 'Let him be crucified.'

When Pilate saw that he was doing no good, but that the uproar was becoming greater, he took water, and washed his hands before the crowd, saying, 'I am innocent of this blood: see to it yourselves.'

Then answered all the people, and said, 'His blood be on us, and on our children.' Then he released Barabbas unto them: but Jesus he had scourged, and delivered him up to be crucified.

Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the Prætorium, and collected about him the whole cohort. And they stripped him, and put on him a scarlet mantle. And they wove a crown of thorns, and put it upon his head, and a cane in his right hand: and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him, saying, 'Hail, King of the Jews!' And they spat on him, and took the cane and beat him on the head. And when they had mocked him thus, they took off the mantle from him, and put his own clothes on him, and led him away to crucify him.

And as they came out, they found a man from Cyrene, Simon by name: him they compelled to carry his cross. And when they came to a place called Golgotha, that is to say, The place of a skull, they gave him wine to drink mixed with gall: and when he had tasted it, he would not drink it. And they crucified him, and they divided his garments by casting lots. And sitting down they watched him there. And they set up over his head the charge against him in writing, namely, 'This is Jesus the King of the Jews.'

Then two thieves were crucified with him, one on the right hand, and one on the left. And the passers-by reviled him, wagging their heads, and saying, 'Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross.' Likewise the chief priests, mocking him with the scribes and Elders, said, 'He saved others; himself he cannot save. If he be the King of Israel, let him come down now from the cross, and we will believe in him. He trusted in God; let Him deliver him now, if He delights in him: for he said, I am the Son of God.' The thieves also, who were crucified with him, reviled him in the same way.

Now from the sixth hour darkness came over all the land unto the ninth hour. And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, '*Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?*' that is, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' And some of the bystanders, when they heard that, said, 'This man calls Elijah.' And straightway one of them ran, and took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar, and put it on a cane, and gave him to drink. But the others said, 'Let be, let us see whether Elijah will come to save him.' But Jesus cried again with a loud voice and expired.

And, behold, the curtain of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth quaked, and the rocks were cleft in sunder; and the graves opened; and many bodies of the saints who slept arose, and came out of their graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many. But when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and the occurrences, they were exceedingly afraid, saying, 'Truly this man was a Son of God.'

And many women were there looking on from a distance, who had followed Jesus from Galilee, ministering unto him: among whom were Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joseph, and the mother of the sons of Zebedee.

Now when it was evening, there came a rich man of Arimathæa, named Joseph, who had also himself become a disciple of Jesus. He went to Pilate, and asked for the body of Jesus. Then Pilate ordered that the body should be given up. And Joseph took the body, and he wrapped it in clean linen, and laid it in his own new sepulchre, which he had hewn out in the rock: and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre, and departed. And Mary Magdalene and the other Mary were there sitting opposite the tomb.

Now the next day, that is the day after the Preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate, saying, 'Lord, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I rise. Command therefore that the sepulchre be securely guarded until the third day, lest his disciples come and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last deception shall be worse than the first.' Pilate said unto them, 'Ye can have a guard: go and make it as secure as ye know how.' So they went, and made the sepulchre secure, by sealing the stone and setting a guard.

CHAPTER XXVIII

But late on the sabbath, as it began to get dark toward the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary came to look at the sepulchre. And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for an angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone, and sat upon it. His appearance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: and for fear of him the keepers shook, and became as dead men. And the angel answered and said unto the women, 'Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, who was crucified. He is not here: for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where he lay. And go quickly, and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead; and, behold, he goeth before you to Galilee; there shall ye see him: lo, I have told you.' And they departed quickly from the sepulchre with fear and great joy; and they ran to bring his disciples word.

And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them, saying, 'Hail.' And they came and seized his feet, and did him reverence. Then said Jesus unto them, 'Fear not; go tell my brethren that they go to Galilee, and there shall they see me.'

Now as they were going, behold, some of the guard came into the city, and reported to the chief priests all that had happened. And they assembled together with the Elders, and resolved, and gave much money unto the soldiers, saying, 'Say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole him while we slept. And if this come to the governor's ears, we will persuade him, and make you free of trouble.' So they took the money, and did as they were taught: and this story was spread abroad among the Jews until this day.

Campus Crusade for Christ Library

But the eleven disciples went into Galilee, to the mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they did him reverence; but some doubted. And Jesus came and spoke unto them, saying, 'All power hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye then, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, unto the end of the Age.'

MATTHEW

CHAPTER I

1–17. The Genealogy of Jesus

(Matthew only)

1 Book of the origin of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of
2 Abraham. Abraham begat Isaac; and Isaac begat Jacob; and
3 Jacob begat Judah and his brothers; and Judah begat Phares
and Zara of Thamar; and Phares begat Esrom; and Esrom begat
4 Aram; and Aram begat Aminadab; and Aminadab begat Naasson;
5 and Naasson begat Salmon; and Salmon begat Boaz of Rachab;
6 and Boaz begat Obed of Ruth; and Obed begat Jesse; and Jesse
begat David the king; and David begat Solomon of the wife of
7 Uriah; and Solomon begat Rehoboam; and Rehoboam begat
8 Abia; and Abia begat Asa; and Asa begat Jehosaphat; and
9 Jehosaphat begat Joram; and Joram begat Oziah; and Oziah
begat Jotham; and Jotham begat Achaz; and Achaz begat Heze-
10 kiah; and Hezekiah begat Manasseh; and Manasseh begat Amon;
11 and Amon begat Josiah; and Josiah begat Jechoniah and his
12 brothers, about the time of the Babylonian captivity; and after
the captivity of Babylon, Jechoniah begat Salathiel; and Salathiel
13 begat Zorobabel; and Zorobabel begat Abiud; and Abiud begat
14 Eliakim; and Eliakim begat Azor; and Azor begat Sadoc; and
15 Sadoc begat Achim; and Achim begat Eliud; and Eliud begat
Eleazar; and Eleazar begat Matthan; and Matthan begat Jacob;
16 and Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born
Jesus, who is called the Christ.

7 So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; and from David until the Babylonian captivity are fourteen generations; and from the Babylonian captivity unto Christ are fourteen generations.

I cannot do better than open the notes upon Matthew with the following quotation from Loisy:

'Both in his subject-matter, as in the order of his material, the redactor of the first Gospel depends upon the second. But before the story of the ministry of Christ, he has placed a preamble, containing a narrative of the conception, the birth and the infancy of Jesus (Chapters i., ii.). After the preliminaries of the Gospel preaching (iii.–iv. 22), he lets us see the main object of his book,—namely, an exposition of what Jesus taught and did (iv. 23). The teaching indeed takes precedence of the doings; the opening of each main section of the work is marked by a considerable oration; a collection of sayings precedes a series of doings. Thus the Sermon on the Mount (iv. 24–vii.) precedes any detailed account of the miracles, and is followed by a series of ten marvels, which the redactor has brought together by taking from Mark a certain number of facts told before the death of John the Baptist, and changing their order (viii.–ix. 34); the speech to the apostles (ix. 35–x.) paves the way for a series of lessons combined with certain pieces of Mark which had not found a place in the preceding section (xi., xii); then comes the discourse of the parables (xiii. 1–52), which is followed by other narratives from Mark (xiii. 53–xvii. 23). A speech of smaller length (xviii.), but important to the Evangelist, because it has to do with the order and the peace of the Christian congregations, precedes the departure for Judæa (xix., xx), and the incidents of the Jerusalem ministry (xxi., xxii.). The oration against the Pharisees (xxiii.), and the apocalypse (xxiv., xxv.), concludes the preaching of Jesus, and introduces the narrative of the Passion and the resurrection (xxvi.–xxviii.).

'It is clear that the two first chapters are an added section put before the preaching of John the Baptist. In these very chapters, however, the opening genealogy (i. 1–17) detaches itself from the following narrative: it had at first a separate existence, and was drawn up without relation to the virgin birth; a gloss at the close (i. 16) adapts it to the narrative, but probably at one time it immediately preceded the story of the Baptist (iii. 1 connects better with i. 17 than with the immediately preceding narrative). The stories of the conception, the birth, the Magi, the flight into Egypt, and the return, are all from the same hand, which seems to be that of the Evangelist himself. Their object is to show the accomplishment of prophecies, and they are arranged with an eye to the oracles which they are supposed to have fulfilled' (*E. S.* I. pp. 120, 121).

Thus the genealogy with which the Gospel opens is obviously only adopted and adapted by the Evangelist. For, if Jesus was not the son of Joseph, the genealogy is worthless and pointless. The genealogy was drawn up in a quarter and at a time in which the belief that Jesus was Joseph's son still existed. As the genealogy was known, the Evangelist thought it well to adopt and include it, though with a necessary modification at its close. For its whole point is to show that Jesus, on the father's side, was descended from David. The 16th verse must therefore have run originally: 'And Joseph begat Jesus.' For if he did not, the whole genealogy would be valueless. There is also some textual evidence. For instance, the Sinaitic Syriac reads: 'Joseph, to whom the Virgin Mary was betrothed, begat Jesus Christ' (see *First Three Gospels*, p. 106, and note on ii. 1). Merx shows that even the S.S. is interpolated. Originally the text ran, 'And Joseph begat Jesus.' Then after verse 17 there followed originally (in all probability) iii. 1 (*Die vier kanonischen Evangelien*, II. 1, pp. viii and 15). Those who are curious to see how orthodox Christian theologians try to avoid the seemingly obvious conclusion drawn from these facts can read Mr Allen's commentary. They can there see it argued that ἐγέννησε throughout the genealogy denotes legal, not physical descent.

Jesus himself apparently never laid claim to Davidic descent. In fact Mark xii. 38 would seem to show that he was conscious that he could make no such claim. The humble family at Nazareth was probably totally ignorant of its ancestors. The genealogies of Luke and Matthew—discordant, the one with the other—are due to the obvious necessity for proving to the Jews the Davidic descent of the Messiah. They were composed after Jesus's death, but before the doctrine of the virgin birth had become widely known and accepted. The partiality for equal numbers, and for the sacred number seven, is shown in verse 17.

As a matter of fact, even including Joseph (or Mary) and Jesus, there are only 14 generations in the third series if Jechoniah (= Jehoiachin) is counted again as the first of the third series as well as the last of the second.

There are errors in the second series: four kings are omitted, *i.e.* Ahaziah (son of Joram), Joash, Amaziah, and Jehoiakim.

In the first series, Rahab is oddly made the mother of Boaz. According to the Old Testament records and genealogies, there must have been 300 years between them. Holtzmann points out that Rahab attained in the New Testament to a certain importance (*cp.* Hebrews xi. 31; James ii. 25). The Rabbis also regard her as a famous proselyte. The genealogist liked to bring in famous women (Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, Bathsheba) as part of the Messiah's ancestry. J. Weiss points out the prominence given to women who in the Old Testament records have some sort of stigma attached to them—Tamar, Rahab, Bathsheba. Ruth was a Moabitess. The occasion for specially naming these women must have been, as J. Weiss thinks, that the Jews cast some reproaches against Mary. 'If the Jews, in spite of those stumbling-blocks, do not cease to honour the sacred history of their nation, they have no reason for bringing a reproach against the new religion on the ground of a suspicion which the Evangelist is about to prove unfounded.'

1. 'Book of the genealogy,' like Genesis v. 1. It is a heading to the genealogy, not to the whole Gospel.

'Jesus Christ,' *cp.* Mark i. 1. The full form was 'the Messiah Jesus,' then came 'Messiah Jesus,' and by an inversion, Messiah becoming a sort of surname, 'Jesus Messiah'—Jesus Christ.

18–25. The Virgin Birth

(Matthew only)

18 Now the birth of Jesus Christ happened thus. After his
mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, but before they came
together, it was found that she was with child of the Holy Spirit.
19 Then Joseph her husband, being a righteous man, and not willing
20 to expose her to shame, determined to divorce her secretly. But
while he thought over these things, behold, an angel of the Lord
appeared unto him in a dream, saying, 'Joseph, son of David, fear
not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which hath been
21 begotten in her is of the Holy Spirit. And she shall bring forth
a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his
people from their sins.'

22 Now all this took place that that might be fulfilled which was
23 spoken by the Lord through the prophet, saying, 'Behold, the
virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they
shall call his name Emmanuel,' which being translated is, God is
with us.

24 And when Joseph arose from his sleep, he did as the angel of
25 the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife. And he

knew her not till she brought forth a son: and he called his name Jesus.

Matthew adopted and edited the genealogy, but this next paragraph is probably his own.

18. The S.S. reads 'of the Messiah' only, without Jesus.

'Betrothed.' They had not yet lived together in one house as man and wife, though they were legally married according to Jewish law. Mary does not appear to know the origin and cause of her pregnant condition. In Luke it is all explained to her. In Matthew, as Loisy observes, she receives no celestial message; the destined name of her son is not previously told to her, but to Joseph, nor is it she who names him after his birth; she is in fact given a less exalted place than in Luke, and Joseph, whose *rôle* is quite secondary in Luke, takes the more important place in Matthew (*E. S.* I. p. 333).

19. *δίκαιος ὤν.* 'A righteous man': used in a special, legal sense. Being 'righteous' he was obliged to divorce her, but he did not wish to put her to open shame. Hence he determines on a secret separation.

δειγματίσαι. 'To expose her to shame.' In actual fact he could not, by mutual arrangement and privately, have legally dissolved the marriage; but in a legendary narrative this difficulty, as Holtzmann says, does not matter.

20. 'An angel in a dream.' Warnings by dreams only occur here, and ii. 12, 13, 19, 22, xxvii. 19, in the New Testament.

21. The name of Jesus is historic; an explanation of it was easy for his disciples. The name lent itself to deeper meanings. It fitted in with the interpretation which was given of his life. Its literal signification is: 'Yahweh is salvation.'

'From their sins.' Jesus urged repentance, in order that the Messianic judgment might not prevent repentant sinners from entering the Kingdom. But here the words sound somewhat more technical, even as a more theological kind of salvation, depending upon a certain faith in Jesus's person, is suggested by xxvi. 28.

22. The first example of Matthew's favourite way of introducing a passage from the Old Testament. The life of Jesus becomes a pre-arranged fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy. There are 14 instances of the phrase 'that it might be fulfilled' in this Gospel.

23. The first example is a very unfortunate one, so far as the meaning of the original Hebrew is concerned. But Matthew gladly follows the Septuagint, which had erroneously translated the Hebrew *almah* (young woman) by 'virgin.' For as Matthew accepted the later tradition that Jesus was born of a virgin, this passage in the Septuagint was an excellent 'proof' for him, as 'proofs' went in those days among both Jews and Christians.

It is, however, a good indication of the careful and honest way in which Matthew used his sources that he includes in his Gospel phrases and even stories which show a complete ignorance of any supernatural origin of Jesus on the part of his mother, and of his family, and of people in general (*cp. e.g.* xii. 46–50, xiii. 55, 56). The origin of the idea of the virgin birth must not be sought in the Septuagint's mistranslation of Isaiah's prophecy. It is not implied in the Septuagint that the virgin is still to be a virgin, so far as man is concerned, when she is with child. The roots lie much deeper. For the real origins those who care can find much of value in the following three little books: Professor Cheyne's *Bible problems and the new material for their solution*; P. Lobstein's *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, and Pfleiderer's *Early Christian Conception of Christ.*

J. Weiss points out that the theory of the virgin birth precludes the other form of the divinity of Jesus which is also found in the New Testament—namely, that Jesus, even before his birth, lived as a divine being in heaven, and then assumed human form and flesh (*cp.* Philippians ii. 6 *seq.*; John i. 14, &c.). The idea which is found in Matthew (and in Luke) 'excludes a pre-existence in Heaven; in the conception of Jesus begins, through a special miraculous act of creation, a new personality which at most had existed previously in the thought of God.' Thus the virgin birth story is still far from an Athanasian coeternity or coequality of the Son with the Father.

Note also (with Weiss) that the birth of Jesus is supposed according to the story to take place after Joseph had taken his wife to his own home. There is no reason to suppose that Jesus was illegitimate or that he was not the son of Joseph.

CHAPTER II

1-12. THE ADORATION OF THE MAGI

(Matthew only)

1 Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judæa in the days
of Herod the king, behold, there came Magi from the east to
2 Jerusalem, saying, 'Where is the new-born King of the Jews?
for we have seen his star in the east, and have come to do him
3 reverence.' When king Herod heard this, he was agitated, and
4 all Jerusalem with him. And he gathered all the chief priests
and scribes of the people together, and he enquired of them
5 where the Messiah was to be born. And they said unto him,
'In Bethlehem of Judæa: for thus it is written by the prophet,
6 And thou Bethlehem, land of Juda, art by no means the least among
the governors of Juda: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that
7 shall feed my people Israel.' Then Herod secretly called the
Magi, and ascertained from them the time when the star had
8 appeared. And he sent them to Bethlehem, and said, 'Go and
make careful enquiries about the child; and when ye have found
him, bring me word again, that I too may come and do him
9 reverence.' When they had heard the king, they departed; and,
lo, the star, which they had seen in the east, went before them,
10 till it came and stood still above where the child was. When
they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy.

11 And when they came into the house, they saw the child with
Mary his mother, and they fell down, and did him reverence: and
they opened their treasures, and they offered unto him gifts; gold
12 and frankincense and myrrh. And being warned by God in a
dream not to return to Herod, they departed into their own
country by another way.

1. Against the older tradition, Jesus is here made out to be, not a Galilæan born in Nazareth, but a Judæan born in Bethlehem. He is born at Bethlehem to suit the prophecy of Micah cited in verse 5.

The Magi represent the heathen world; they, too, are interested in the birth of the Messiah. As to the origin of the legend, see Carpenter, *First Three Gospels*, pp. 108, 109, 119, 120, and Usener, in the article 'Nativity Narratives' in *Encyclopædia Biblica*, col. 3351. Those who would like to see a modern plea for the historical character of the story, and even of the slaughter of the Innocents (in a somewhat restricted form), should read Mr Allen's commentary, pp. 11–22.

2. The special star, or comet, which appears at great men's births and deaths is a common feature of legend. The Messiah's birth must also have its special star. Numbers xxiv. 17 will have helped to form the story. For further conjectures as to the possible origin of the legend, see Schmidt, *Prophet of Nazareth*, pp. 242–246.

4. Herod's action is charmingly naïve!

6. The Hebrew text is considerably altered. Perhaps Matthew used some loose, oral, Aramaic translation. The original passage in Micah seems merely to mean that the Messiah shall be of David's line.

8. Herod's request that they shall return to him so that he, too, may go and worship is given in obvious craft. It is curious that Holtzmann, not perceiving this, solemnly calls Herod's pretext 'incredible.' One most not break the butterfly of legend upon critical wheels. As Loisy says: 'One must not ask why Herod employed these strangers on an investigation which his own police could have executed far better.'

11. They worship and offer precious gifts in good eastern fashion (*cp.* Isaiah lx. 6). It is a pretty legend.

13–15. THE FLIGHT INTO EGYPT

(Matthew only)

13 And after they had departed, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream, saying, 'Arise, and take the child and his mother, and flee into Egypt, and be thou there until I

tell thee: for Herod is about to seek the child to destroy him.'
14 So he arose, and he took the child and his mother by night, and
15 departed into Egypt. And he was there until the death of
Herod: that that might be fulfilled which was spoken by the
Lord through the prophet, saying, 'Out of Egypt have I called
my son.'

13. Many heroes have troublous childhoods; *e.g.* Moses, Cyrus, and several others.

15. Another fulfilment. In reality Hosea referred to Israel in this passage. The flight is invented on the basis of the passage in Hosea and on the general idea that Jesus, the Son of God, the incarnation of the true Israel, must also be called out of Egypt like Israel of old.

16–18. THE MASSACRE OF THE INNOCENTS

(Matthew only)

16 Then Herod, when he saw that the Magi had deluded him,
was exceeding wroth, and he sent and slew all the male children
that were in Bethlehem, and in all its district, from two years old
and under, according to the time which he had ascertained from
17 the Magi. Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremiah
18 the prophet, saying, 'A voice is heard in Rama; weeping and
much lamentation; Rachel weepeth for her children, and will not
be comforted, because they are not.'

16. There is no reason to suppose, and there is no confirmatory evidence, that Herod ever did anything of the kind here suggested. The story is more or less modelled upon that of Moses.

18. The passage from Jeremiah is, in reality, not a prophecy, but a retrospect. The personified Israel bewails the loss of the many Israelites who have been led away into Babylonian captivity.

19–23. THE JOURNEY TO GALILEE

(Matthew only)

19 But when Herod died, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared
20 in a dream to Joseph in Egypt, saying, 'Arise, take the child and

his mother, and go to the land of Israel: for they who sought the
21 child's life are dead.' So he arose, and took the child and his
22 mother, and came to the land of Israel. But when he heard that
Archelaus was king over Judæa in the place of his father Herod,
he was afraid to go thither: but, being warned by God in a dream,
23 he withdrew into the region of Galilee. And he came and dwelt
in a city called Nazareth: that that might be fulfilled which was
spoken through the prophets, 'He shall be called a Nazarene.'

20. The language is purposely modelled on Exodus iv. 19 He who was greater than Moses, and fulfilled (or supplanted?) the Law which Moses gave, must have an early history which is parallel with, though it excels, the early history of Moses in danger and providential arrangement.

22. Archelaus was ethnarch, not king. The story is rather clumsy here. The angel apparently forgot to tell Joseph about Archelaus, and the narrator forgets that Antipas the ruler of Galilee was also a son of Herod.

23. By a roundabout process, Jesus is thus settled in his historic native town. The birth at Bethlehem and the journey to Egypt were apparently invented to make unreal fulfilments of misconceived prophetic passages. Finally, even the dwelling in Nazareth is made such a fulfilment. What it fulfils is, however, very obscure, as there is no passage in the prophets which says that the Messiah shall be called a 'Nazarene.' One rather superficial interpretation is that what the writer meant was a somewhat poor play upon words between 'Nazareth,' Jesus's dwelling-place, and 'netzer,' a shoot, or branch, applied in Isaiah xi. 1 to the Messiah: 'And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a *branch* out of his root shall bear fruit.' The word 'branch' is in the Hebrew *netzer*. 'Had the Evangelist some lost or apocryphal document in his thought, or was his fancy only playing round some ancient word in which he imaginatively saw the name of Nazareth foreshadowed? The latter is the more probable' (Carpenter, *First Three Gospels*, p. 45). It has also been suggested that in the age of Jesus there was no city of Nazareth at all. 'No such town as Nazareth is mentioned in the Old Testament, in Josephus, or in the Talmud' (Cheyne in *Encyc. Biblica*, *s.v.* 'Nazareth,' col. 3360). The idea is that Nazareth means really Galilee, and Nazarene means Galilæan. It is at any rate remarkable that there did exist a village called Bethlehem of Zebulun (Joshua xix. 15), which was situated only seven miles from the present Nazareth. In the Talmud this place is called

'Zoriyah,' which may be a corruption from 'Notzeriyah,' *i.e.* the Nazarene or Galilæan Bethlehem. Hence too the origin of the tradition that Jesus was born at Bethlehem. He was born there, but not in the Bethlehem of Judah, but of Galilee. 'The title Bethlehem-Nazareth was misunderstood by some of the transmitters of the tradition, so that while some said, "Jesus was born at Bethlehem," others said "Jesus was born at Nazareth."' In Mark vi., the name of Jesus's 'fatherland,' or *πάτρις*, is not stated. A more radical explanation is furnished by M. Friedländer, *Synagoge und Kirche in ihren Anfängen* (1908). Jesus was called the Nazarene, because he was connected with and preached among the Jewish sect of the Nazarenes, who existed before Jesus, as is emphatically asserted by Epiphanius. But of this hypothesis I have no space to speak here, nor have I the adequate learning and capacity. If we reject these various suggestions and hypotheses, we must content ourselves with the bare confession of J. Weiss, that, so far, all explanations are 'Notbehelfe: wir wissen nicht was Matthäus mit diesem Weissagungsbeweis meint.'

My notes upon these first two chapters are purposely scrappy and brief. For these chapters have nothing to do with the actual life and teaching of Jesus upon which I want to concentrate attention. Those of my readers who would like to know more about the details and origins of the stories here told can easily find what they require in the commentaries of Loisy, Holtzmann and others.

CHAPTER III

1–12. JOHN THE BAPTIST

(*Cp.* Mark i. 1–8; Luke iii. 1–18)

1 In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilder-
2 ness of Judæa, and saying, 'Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven
3 hath drawn nigh.' For this is he that was spoken of by the
prophet Isaiah, saying, 'The voice of one crying in the wilderness,
4 Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.' And
John had his clothing of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about
5 his loins; and his food was locusts and wild honey. Then went
out to him Jerusalem, and all Judæa, and all the region round
6 about the Jordan, and they were baptized by him in the Jordan,
confessing their sins.

7 But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come
to the baptism, he said unto them, 'O offspring of vipers, who
8 hath suggested to you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring
9 forth, then, fruit befitting repentance: and think not to say to
yourselves, We have Abraham for father: for I say unto you, that
God is able to raise up children unto Abraham from these stones.
10 Already is the axe laid unto the root of the trees: every tree,
then, which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast
11 into the fire. I baptize you with water unto repentance: but he
that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not
worthy to bear: he will baptize you with Holy Spirit, and fire.
12 His winnowing fan is in his hand, and he will purify his threshing
floor, and gather his wheat into the granary; but he will burn up
the chaff with unquenchable fire.'

2. What John says in Matthew is much the same as what Jesus says in Mark i. 15; the words in Mark i. 4 about the 're-mission of sins' are omitted, perhaps, because, as Loisy says (*E. S.* I. p. 121), 'on songe au baptême du Christ.'

John and Jesus, then, begin with the same general message: 'Repent: the great day is at hand; then there will be no more chance to repent, for then there will be separation and judgment: the good will enter the Kingdom; the bad will enter Gehenna.' How far we are from this conception! This fundamental difference must never be lost sight of in dealing with the religious teaching of Jesus. The conception of progress and purification after death, so profoundly vital and significant to us, was quite unknown to him.

'Kingdom of heaven' and 'Father in heaven' are phrases used by Matthew. Mark says 'Kingdom of God.' 'Father in heaven' was common among the Rabbis. But Jesus probably said 'Kingdom of God.' Dalman (*Worte Jesu*, I. p. 77), however, thinks that Jesus followed the usual Jewish custom, 'for he too liked to avoid an unnecessary use of the word God.' So too Loisy, *E. S.* I. p. 229, n. 6. Whether Jesus used the phrase 'Our father who art in heaven,' which is also Rabbinic, cannot be known with certainty.

7–10. Compare Luke iii. 7–9. These verses are not found in Mark: their source is Q, who may be supposed also to have included 11 and 12 whether these latter two verses are parallel to, or the source of, Mark i. 7, 8. Thus Q probably started at the same point of departure as Mark.

7. Matthew often unites the Pharisees and Sadducees. He probably had only a vague, unhistorical idea who the Pharisees and Sadducees were. All he knew, or cared to know, was that they were opponents of his hero. Therefore they were bad people, for Matthew is a partisan, and uses the ordinary partisan language. The words which follow have no value as historical evidence about the characters of the real 'Pharisees' or the real 'Sadducees.' For a short description and estimate of them as they actually were, see Additional Note 25. In the parallel passage in Luke, the vituperative speech is not addressed to the Pharisees and Sadducees, but to the 'people' generally. This may be more original, or it may be Luke's correction to avoid the contradiction with the statement in Matt. xxi. 32, Luke vii. 30 that the Pharisees and Sadducees refused to receive the baptism of John. The vehement words are in keeping with the character of John.

τίς ὑπέδειξεν. The translation is not quite easy. Matthew seems to suppose that the Pharisees sought baptism hypocritically.

They thought the mere *rite* was enough to secure them immunity from the 'wrath to come.' Hence John says: 'Who suggested (or indicated) to you that you could escape from the wrath?' The mere baptism, he says, will not do it. You must show by a better life that your repentance has been more than outward. This is sound, prophetic, and also Rabbinic doctrine. When, however, John goes on to represent the Pharisees as saying: 'Our mere Abrahamic descent is enough to save us,' it would appear as if, in reality, he had urged those who despised his baptism, and regarded the summons to repentance as unnecessary (because their mere Jewish blood secured their safety), to forego their false confidence, and to be baptized and to repent. For like Amos, John argues that God can reject his people. He can, in his omnipotence, make a new people out of stones. Anyhow, the Judgment is imminent, and its methods will be irrespective of race. Only those whose lives are good will escape 'eternal fire.' This warning against a narrow self-delusion and self-righteousness based upon race was probably startling and novel. It renewed the teaching of the eighth-century prophets. That at the great Day of Judgment God would punish Israel's foes and deliver Israel was a fixed dogma of the age. John and Jesus proclaim aloud the old prophetic faith: for unrighteousness there shall be no escape. The sinful Jew shall not be exempt because of his race or nationality.

8. The word μετάνοια occurs in Matthew only here and iii. 3 (Q). In Mark it only occurs in i. 4. The verb (μετανοεῖν) only occurs in Mark in i. 15 and in vi. 12. In Matthew it occurs in iii. 2, iv. 17, xi. 20, 21 (Q), xii. 41 (Q). An examination of these few passages would seem to show that the teaching of Jesus which the disciples cared most to preserve did not *directly* harp upon the mere term and word 'repentance.' Jesus took a more original line of effecting an end common both to himself and to John. He encouraged, stimulated, comforted. He did not merely din a summons to repentance into people's ears. Luke has the noun five times, the verb nine times.

11, 12 = Mark i. 7, 8. Mark said that John baptized with water, Jesus with the higher baptism of the Holy Spirit. Jesus gives a higher grace, a better gift than John. This idea is only in the background here. In the foreground is the idea that John is the precursor of the Judgment; he summons to repentance; Jesus is the lord and executor of the Judgment. He apportions to good and bad their final and everlasting doom. As to the original reading, see the note on Mark i. 8; Matthew combines Q's 'fire' and Mark's 'Holy Spirit.'

The threshing-floor is heaped up with chaff and wheat. It is 'cleansed' by sifting the chaff from the wheat. The one is burnt; the other garnered. The figure has many Old Testament parallels (*e.g.* Jeremiah xv. 7).

13–17. THE BAPTISM OF JESUS

(*Cp.* Mark i. 9–11; Luke iii. 21, 22)

13 Then Jesus came from Galilee to the Jordan unto John, to
14 be baptized by him. But John sought to prevent him, saying,
15 'I need to be baptized by thee, and comest thou to me?' But
Jesus answered and said unto him, 'Permit it for the present;
for thus it befitteth us to fulfil all righteousness.' Then he per-
16 mitted him. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straight-
way out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened, and he
saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and coming upon
17 him: and, lo, a voice from heaven, saying, 'This is my beloved
Son, in whom I am well pleased.'

14. The insertion which Matthew makes here is to meet the objection how Jesus, who was sinless, could have required or undergone a baptism which was connected with repentance. But if John had thus early recognized Jesus as Messiah, he would not have sent the enquiry of xi. 2, 3.

15. Jesus explains that a merely temporary necessity must be fulfilled. 'To fulfil all righteousness' means to satisfy all divine ordinances till the new revelation is ripe or ready. The baptism is regarded as a kind of divine requirement. It need scarcely be said that the insertion must be completely unhistorical.

17. Here the voice does not address itself to Jesus, but to John or the bystanders. In Mark sight and sound are for Jesus alone. Both versions are doubtless equally unhistorical, but the second marks a later stage than the first. The baptism is no longer the moment at which Jesus becomes the Son of God. It is only the moment at which others are told of his true status. He has been the special Son of God since his birth. Mr Allen says we must render: 'This is my Son, the Beloved,' &c. For 'the Beloved' is an independent title, equivalent to the Messiah. It is taken from Isaiah xlii. 1, Septuagint.

For the baptism Matthew undoubtedly used Mark. Whether Q had also a baptism story is uncertain.

CHAPTER IV

1-11. The Temptation

(*Cp.* Mark i. 12, 13; Luke iv. 1-13)

1 Then was Jesus led up by the Spirit into the wilderness to be
2 tempted by the devil. And when he had fasted forty days and
3 forty nights, afterwards he hungered. And the Tempter came up
to him, and said, 'If thou be the Son of God, say that these stones
4 may become bread.' But he answered and said, 'It is written,
Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that pro-
5 ceedeth out of the mouth of God.' Then the devil took him up
into the holy city, and set him upon the pinnacle of the temple,
6 and said unto him, 'If thou be the Son of God, throw thyself
down: for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning
thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time
7 thou dash thy foot against a stone. Jesus said unto him, 'Again
8 it is written, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' Then the
devil took him up again on to an exceeding high mountain, and
shewed him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them;
9 and he said unto him, 'All these things will I give thee, if thou
10 wilt fall down and do me reverence.' Then said Jesus unto him,
'Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt do reverence
11 to the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.' Then the
devil left him, and, behold, angels came and ministered unto him.

For his account of the temptation Matthew went, not to Mark, but to Q. Whether Mark's version is independent, or a mere epitome of Q's is disputed. It looks, it must be confessed, like an abbreviation of some longer narrative.

The story, or symbolic myth, of the temptation occupies two verses in Mark, eleven in Matthew, and thirteen in Luke. The best and most easily available explanation of it is to be found in Mr Carpenter's splendid book, *The First Three Gospels* (pp. 134–143).

Many causes may have combined to produce the story. First of all, there was the view that some great heroes of olden times, *e.g.* Abraham and Job, had been 'tempted' and had conquered. Jesus, who was greater than Abraham, must also have been a greater conqueror. Secondly, there was the belief that one of the functions of the Messiah was to conquer Satan, the chief devil, and to overcome the demons (see, for this view, Additional Note 33). Thirdly, there were parallels in other religions, and it is not impossible that the temptation stories of Buddha may have influenced the Gospel narratives. Fourthly, the story puts at the beginning of the life of Jesus, in one concentrated and highly imaginative form, certain real temptations with which he possibly had to grapple in the course of his actual life.

It is usually said that these temptations were mainly two-fold: the temptation to ask God for signs and miracles, and the temptation to aim at worldly power. It is likely enough that the opponents of Jesus, or those who hesitated whether to believe his message or no, often asked him for a sign, a miracle. Instead of teaching, they wanted miraculous doing. Jesus did, according to the Gospels, work 'wonders,' but these were incidental to his teaching; they were mainly miracles of healing or compassion. There was no formal 'sign,' like the sign granted to Elijah in the trial scene between him and the prophets of Baal. In the actual life of Jesus we have still further to discount the miracles, such even as they are, which the Gospel narrates. Many of them, we hold, did not happen. In that case the desire to have the question settled by miracle would have been all the stronger. The German Protestant theologians regard this desire as sceptical or unspiritual, and therefore as characteristically Jewish. 'Wundersucht' is odious in their eyes. But I am not so sure that they are right. For Jesus put forward teaching which ran counter to the letter of the Law. If he was right, the Law was wrong. Could the Law—the word of God—be wrong? Nothing less than a very big miracle, or many big miracles, could make it likely that teaching which criticised the Law could possibly be right.

Jesus, doubtless, according to the views of his age, as he believed intensely in the divineness of his mission, believed that he could work miracles. He may, very probably, have believed that he had only to ask God to perform a miracle, and a miracle would happen. But he may have also believed that to make such a request to God was to tempt Him (Matt. iv. 7; Deut. vi. 16). He may have believed that his cause was to triumph, not by miracle, but by its own inherent power and truth. He may have felt that his life and his teaching were to prove themselves, and that no external, even miraculous, actions or events could add authority to them. In such a belief there was truth and nobility of soul, as well as courage, conviction, and self-restraint. Why should we not credit Jesus with these virtues?

Secondly, it is possible that, towards the close of his ministry, Jesus may have realized that his mission was to succeed, and the Kingdom of God to be inaugurated, by his own suffering and death. In that case all suggestions to found an earthly sovereignty prematurely were mere temptations of the Evil One. His conception of his Messiahship may have been the conception of the suffering servant, through whose stripes and death men were healed, rather than that of the righteous and conquering king. In that case any appeal to force, any solicitation to become King of the Jews, in the old, outward, material sense, would have seemed to him the temptation of Satan. If the story which we read in Mark viii. 33 be historic, this must be its explanation. Jesus by that time may have come to believe that he was indeed the Messiah, but not the Messiah whom current desire or opinion expected. The consummation of his earthly career was the cross, not the crown. Hence his outburst to Peter, who seems to him to represent the very devil himself. It is this temptation, which could only have arisen when the Messianic views of Jesus had been fully developed, and when he foresaw the fatal, but yet inevitable and predestined, close of his career, which, in the story of Matt. iv. 1–11, is placed at the opening of his ministry.

This explanation of the temptation in the wilderness is suggestive and may be true. It seems, however, to involve a large insight into the inner consciousness of Jesus. It may read too much into the whole story, the origin of which may be adequately accounted for by Old Testament and Buddhistic parallels and by the beliefs of the time. In his sketch of the career of Jesus, Loisy thinks the only safe thing to say is that after his baptism Jesus 'remained some time in the desert.' The proleptic anticipation of his Messiahship on earth involved the story of a temptation. For the Messiah had to fight and conquer Satan. Historically the temptation which Jesus had to undergo was his death (Mark xiv. 36–38). But if he were Messiah from his baptism, an encounter with Satan had to be arranged for him (*E. S.* I. pp. 185, 186).

1. The whole purpose of the sojourn in the wilderness is said to be the temptation. This goes beyond Mark. 'Quoique la retraite de Jésus au désert n'ait rien que de vraisemblable en soi, le tableau est symbolique au même titre que la transfiguration' (*E. S.* I. p. 138).

2. In Mark the angels apparently feed Jesus *during* the forty days; they do not merely appear after the temptation is over, as in Matthew. Nor is the hunger of Jesus the primary motive of the temptation, as in Matthew. The forty days and the fasting are borrowed from the story of Moses.

3. The term 'Son of God' seems here employed as a title of the Messiah (see *First Three Gospels*, p. 77). We may, however, compare the argument about the son or child of God in the Wisdom of Solomon, ii. 13–18.

4. The quotation is from Deut. viii. 3. This verse from Deuteronomy and its predecessor are at least partially responsible for the make-up of the story. As Israel was 'tempted' in the wilderness, so was Jesus, but a more advanced theology ascribed temptations to Satan rather than to God (contrast 2 Sam. xxiv. 1 with 1 Chron. xxi. 1). Jesus asserts that the word of God will provide for his physical needs. God can, by his creative word, fashion material whereby man's life can be sustained, as he did in the case of the manna. More simply, God will provide adequately for the physical needs of his messenger.

5. The devil is highly personified. In Mark he is called 'Satan,' and so Jesus calls him here in 10. Matthew follows the Septuagint, and uses the word 'Diabolos.'

The pinnacle (*πτερύγιον*) must have been some well-known jutting-out spot upon the roof of the Temple. Jesus is carried about by the devil as Ezekiel is carried about by the hand of the Spirit (viii. 3, &c.).

By quoting Deut. vi. 16 'Jesus means to say that he had no right to throw himself into uncommanded danger, and then expect God to deliver him' (Toy, *Quotations in the New Testament*, p. 22). 'Le Messie n'a pas le droit de faire servir la puissance divine à ses caprices. Dieu seul choisit les occasions de la manifester; il en faut pas les lui imposer' (*E. S.* I. p. 420). This temptation sums up the refusal of Jesus to work idle signs and miracles.

8. The third is the main temptation. There seems to be already contained in the suggestion of the devil the implicit idea that the kingdoms of the world, and all material power, are part of the realm of Satan. *This* world is evil and in the power of the devil. The quotation of Jesus is from Deut. vi. 13.

10. *Ὕπαγε, σατανᾶ. Cp.* Mark viii. 33. Is this the original? So W. would argue.

The last temptation is commonly supposed to indicate that

Jesus steadfastly renounced all popular and national conceptions of the Messianic kingdom. So too M. Loisy, who says: 'The sovereignty of the world was in fact the right of the Messiah, and Jesus may have wondered why the heavenly Father did not give it to him at once. But to seek sovereignty for the sake of sovereignty, without waiting for God's hour, to share the interests and the passions of the world, to make himself at the outset the echo of popular aspirations, the champion of national independence, to aim at an ordinary royalty, and adopt the means which might lead to it, that is to say, human policy, cunning, and violence, would be to determine to rule by means of Satan, and not by means of God, and to abandon the cause of the heavenly Father for that of the devil. Hence Jesus, at this extreme limit of the temptation, drives away the tempter: "Get thee hence, Satan"' (*E. S.* I. p. 422).

I gather that M. Loisy holds that the temptation in the desert was a real fact in the history of Jesus. It was known that he did not at once reappear in Galilee after his baptism. Jesus must have spoken 'in general terms' of his residence in the desert and of his inward temptations there. Upon this basis the stories of the temptation of the devil were spun out. For Jesus himself, speaking of the moral difficulties which are here called 'temptings,' would not have hesitated to attribute them to Satan. Thus the temptation narratives have no mythical, but a historical, origin. The details are, however, 'made up' out of Old Testament reminiscences, popular beliefs and the later experiences and history of Jesus. M. Loisy's explanation is purely conjectural. It may be as he says: Jesus *may* have spoken in 'general terms' about his inward trials and his spiritual victory after the baptism —but one feels how extremely subjective and hypothetical all this explanation is.

And how far is Loisy right when he says that the great temptation of all was the Messianic ideal of his contemporaries and of his 'entourage'? First of all, M. Loisy's hypothesis supposes that Jesus already felt and knew himself to be the Messiah. This is extremely unlikely, but we will let it pass and assume it. But how curiously limited is the difference between M. Loisy's conception of Jesus's Messiahship and that of his 'entourage.' Or rather how careful one must be in order to make up a difference to degrade the conception of the entourage or to despoil it of all its spiritual features. For to Loisy Jesus is a real Messiah, not merely a spiritual teacher of fine religion. He is the Messiah of the Jews, promised to Israel. There is to be a real dominion, upon a regenerated earth. The rule of the Romans is to disappear. Jesus did not go to Jerusalem to die, though the possibility of death may have entered his mind. But his hope was to triumph; in other words, his hope was that God would at last intervene and bring about the final deliverance of the completed Kingdom.

Where is the great difference of all this from the Messianic ideal of his contemporaries? The difference is largely imaginary; but it has to be assumed because Jesus must be not merely a great teacher, a sublime figure, but wholly different from his contemporaries, wholly unlike every other Jew. But unluckily the facts are against this arrangement of Jesus by himself on the one side, and of every other Jew, separated by a great gulf of morality and religion, upon the other. It is true there was a 'zealot' party who wanted to aid God by physical force. But, in spite of Isaiah xi., the majority of Rabbis were inclined to think that the Kingdom would come by divine intervention, just as Jesus thought that it would come. Where, then, is the great difference between their view and his? I do not perceive it. M. Loisy indeed says: 'It was inconceivable to his contemporaries that the Messiah could be poor, could dispense with striking signs and with a kingdom in this world; and Jesus regarded as a suggestion of the devil's the idea of laying any claim, in his character as the Messiah, to earthly wealth, or of enhancing his reputation by miracles, or of seeking royalty; he trusted in the will of the Father, understanding that his present mission was first to attain for himself, and then to lead others to rise to, that moral condition which was needed for the coming of the Kingdom of heaven. He saw what the world could offer him, the royalty that his fellow countrymen were fully disposed to confer upon him; and he saw also and chose freely the wholly spiritual *rôle*, humble and dangerous at the same time, which the will of the Father assigned to him. That was really the temptation of Christ; no one but Jesus could have been tempted in this way' (*E. S.* I. p. 423). I do not deny that what M. Loisy here says may contain some truth. When Jesus came to believe that he was the Messiah, the temptation may have come to him: 'Shall I try to collect an army? shall I fight for the Messianic crown?' And then he may have thought that his vocation and duty were to do what M. Loisy so well describes, and to leave the issue to God. God, not he, shall supply the 'force,' and intervene for the final triumph. Mr Abrahams will tell us whether such an idea was so wholly un-Jewish (Additional Note 33); I do not believe that it was. In any case the difference would be one of means to an ultimate end. The end was the same both to Jesus and to many of the Rabbis. And the more proximate means were the same too: the intervention of God, and the establishment of the Kingdom supernaturally and miraculously.

It is interesting, as M. Loisy says, to note that, according to

Matthew, 'Jesus, after the third temptation, is found in the desert, without its being said how he had returned there, and as if he had not been physically away from it. The narrative of the first Gospel thus wavers between the material and exterior reality of the temptation and the moral and psychological reality' (*E. S.* I. p. 425).

12–17. The Return to Galilee

(*Cp.* Mark i. 14, 15; Luke iv. 14, 15)

12 Now when Jesus heard that John had been delivered up, he
13 withdrew into Galilee. And leaving Nazareth, he came and dwelt
in Capernaum, which is by the lake, in the district of Zebulon and
14 Naphthali: that that might be fulfilled which was spoken through
15 Isaiah, the prophet, saying, 'The land of Zebulon, and the land of
Naphthali, towards the lake, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the gentiles;
16 the people which sat in darkness hath seen a great light; and to
them who sat in the region and shadow of death a light hath
arisen.'

17 From that time Jesus began to proclaim and say, 'Repent: for the kingdom of heaven hath drawn nigh.'

12. Matthew follows Mark's order up to 22. The phrase used gives the impression as if Jesus had fled into Galilee. This is inaccurate. For one thing, Antipas's territory included Galilee.

14. Matthew's love of 'fulfilments' leads him to strange interpretations. The obscure passage from Isaiah, here quoted with various modifications from the original Hebrew text, is, however, a Messianic prophecy. 'Galilee of the nations,' or, rather, 'district of the nations' (Hebrew *gelîl*), was a district in the territory of Naphtali, with a considerable heathen population. In later times this 'district' (*gelîl*) was called Galilee, though Galilee included more land than the old 'district.'

17 = Mark i. 14, 15. The words put into Jesus's mouth are identically the same with those put into the mouth of John, iii. 2.

18–22. The First Four Apostles

(*Cp.* Mark i. 16–20)

18 And Jesus, walking by the lake of Galilee, saw two brothers,
Simon called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into
19 the lake: for they were fishermen. And he said unto them,

20 'Come hither after me, and I will make you fishers of men.' And
they straightway left their nets, and followed him.
21 And going on from there, he saw two other brothers, James
the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, in a boat, with Zebedee
22 their father, mending their nets; and he called them. And they
immediately left the boat and their father, and followed him.

20. Mark gives the abandoned father some 'hired servants'; Matthew omits them.

23–25. PREACHING IN GALILEE

(Matthew only)

23 And Jesus went about in all Galilee, teaching in their
synagogues, and proclaiming the Good Tidings of the kingdom,
and healing every sickness and every disease among the people.
24 And the report of him went out through all Syria: and they
brought unto him all that were suffering with divers diseases
and afflicted with torments, and those who were possessed with
demons, and those who were moonstruck and paralyzed; and he
25 healed them. And there followed him great crowds of people
from Galilee, and from the Ten Cities, and from Jerusalem, and
from Judæa, and from beyond Jordan.

Matthew here leaves Mark's order. He wants to tell of the teaching of Jesus even before he tells of his deeds and wonders. Before each group of 'deeds' he inserts, or groups, a collection of sayings. So now he prepares the way by three summarizing verses for the Sermon on the Mount. Yet he depends on Mark for his summary. *Cp.* Mark i. 39 and iii. 7–10. So too for the scene of the Sermon we have Mark's familiar mountain.

24. 'Moonstruck,' *i.e.* epileptics. It is noteworthy that the S.S. has a less exaggerated form of text. '*Many* are brought and he heals them all.' It seems more original.

CHAPTER V

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

The fifth and two following chapters of Matthew are occupied with the famous Sermon on the Mount. This 'Sermon' corresponds with the Sermon in the Plain in Luke (vi. 17). But Matthew's Sermon is longer than Luke's. It includes passages the parallels of which in Luke are found elsewhere than in the Sermon in the Plain, and it includes other passages which do not occur in Luke at all.

Both Matthew and Luke drew from a common source, which each used and 'edited' in a different way. A good deal of the Sermon stood in Q, that old and important document which Luke and Matthew both drew upon. Harnack clearly believes that much, or even very much, which Q attributes to Jesus is rightly attributed. Naturally (from his conception of Jesus) he is most eager that this should be so, and most especially as regards the Sermon on the Mount and Matthew xi. 25–27. The passages which certainly belong to Q in the Sermon are likely to be those which are common to Luke and to Matthew. From a minute examination of the order of all Q passages in Luke and Matthew, Harnack comes to the conclusion that the passages in the Sermon which are common to Matthew and Luke, but which do not stand in the same order in both (being in Luke outside the Sermon) stood in Q where Matthew has them. Luke scattered them from reasons which we are unable to discover. The Q passages in the Sermon are:

v. 3, 4, 6, 11–13, 15, 18, 25, 26, 32, 39, 40, 42, 44–48.
vi. 11–13, 19, 20, 21–33.
vii. 1–5, 7–14, 16–18, 21, 24–27.

In addition to these the following verses were perhaps in Q:

v. 14, 16, 41. vi. 34. vii. 22, 23.

B. Weiss's assignment to Q is somewhat different, but he considers that the original Sermon on the Mount was smaller than the passages which belong to Q. For many passages which Matthew wove into the Sermon, though taken from Q, yet stood originally in other positions. The original Sermon after the opening beatitudes, 3, 4, 6, 10–12, was exclusively concerned with the polemic of Jesus against the interpretation of the Law by the Scribes and against the fulfilment of the Law by the Pharisees, *i.e.*, v. 17–22, 27, 28, 31–48, vi. 1–6, 16–18, vii. 1–5, 12 (*Quellen*, A, p. 258 and other references, B, pp. 5–14).

Doubtless much in the 'Sermons' of both Gospels was spoken by Jesus, but a good deal is later. The form and arrangement of the Sermon in Matthew are either the Evangelist's own or, at any rate, later than Jesus. Indeed Wernle is perhaps not going much too far when he says (*Sources*, p. 138): 'In reality what we have here are separate, detached utterances from all parts of his life—with a whole year, perhaps, between two adjacent sentences—put side by side because they are connected by the same subject-matter, the will of God and righteousness. And the underlying thoughts which unite them are not those of Jesus, but those of the original Christian community.'

Though the parallel is incomplete, it can hardly be doubted that Jesus on the mountain is meant to recall Moses on Sinai; Matthew wants to contrast, as M. Loisy says, the two Laws: the one old, imperfect and transitory; the other new, perfect and definitive. The Law of Jesus fulfils the Law of Moses and the teaching of the prophets. This idea is wanting in Luke, but seems to dominate Matthew.

The 'crowd' is little thought of; the disciples, who here mean the Christian community, are addressed. The *mise-en-scène* is the early Church of the age of the Evangelist. The distinguished Semitic scholar Merx believes that the great mass of the Sermon upon the Mount was really spoken by Jesus. But certain accretions have to be removed, and the original readings restored, as can often, in his opinion, be done by the help of the Sinaitic Syriac. Merx thinks it of the utmost importance to realize that the Sermon was spoken not to the crowd, to whom Jesus spoke in parable, but to the disciples only. It contains his esoteric teaching for the innermost circle of disciples. v. 1 really meant to say: 'Seing a crowd, he sought to avoid them, and so he went up a mountain and sat down, and his disciples drew near to him.' The S.S. (= Sinaitic Syriac) to some extent supports this view.

W. regards the Sermon as Q's extended parallel for Mark i. 14, 15. It is the programme with which Jesus starts his career, or rather it is the summary of his early Galilæan preaching. But great, says W., is the contrast between them. 'In Mark a short unpretentious summing up of the general and constantly recurring contents of Jesus's preaching; here an artistic, worked out manifesto. And there is also a difference of matter. In Mark Jesus's theme is the same as that of the Baptist, namely repentance; the near approach of the Kingdom is the motive; Jesus threatens and stirs. But in Q Jesus, unlike John, shows straightway at the commencement the other side of the Kingdom. Er lockt damit, er verkündet es als Freudenbotschaft. He begins, not with a solemn warning to the whole Jewish people, but with beatitudes for his disciples.' But all this, according to Harnack, is no proof that Q is secondary to, or later than Mark. First, Harnack urges that in Mark i. 15, the last words, 'believe in the Gospel' must not be ignored. For in them Mark also included from the first the other side, the Glad Tidings, in the theme of Jesus's preaching. He does this moreover in a 'much more secondary form' than Q in whom the word Gospel (εὐαγγέλιον) is not found. Secondly the Sermon ought not to be brought into parallelism with Mark i. 14, 15. 'Das Evangelium in Q sind die Makarismen' (*cp.* xi. 4, 5). Why should not Q have been justified in placing these Glad Tidings (the historicity of which cannot be questioned), in sharp contrast to the preaching of John, at the beginning of his book? Even if the Glad Tidings was originally more closely knit with the summons to repent than appears in Q, why should the separation of the one part from the other produce what is secondary? Moreover, is not the whole Sermon a powerful call to repentance? 'For what sort of a notion should we frame of Jesus's preaching about repentance? It cannot have consisted in the mere repetition of the fixed formula, but must have described conversion and the new disposition. And that is just what the Sermon on the Mount does' (*Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, pp. 141, 142).

Again, Harnack would sharply distinguish between the *mise-en-scène* of Matthew and that of Q. It may indeed be that the Sermon as the most important specimen of Jesus's teaching was put at the beginning, but that does not prove that the compiler coloured the words of Jesus by reference to later times. *Cp.* on 11 and 12. So, too, Harnack says: 'Ecclesiastical organisation and the Church, as St Matthew knows them, do not appear in Q. The sayings apply to the individual even when they are addressed to the multitude. The controversy of Christianity with Judaism as between two distinct religious principles (*die prinzipielle Auseinandersetzung mit dem Judentum*), the opposition of the old and new precepts, are wanting; only in reference to divorce does Jesus go beyond the Law. Elsewhere it is said that the Law abides so long as heaven and earth remain' (*Sayings of Jesus*, p. 229; German edition, p. 159). By implication we may infer that Harnack would not claim the famous antitheses in v. 21, 27, 33, 38, 43 for Jesus.

1–12. The Beatitudes

(*Cp.* Luke vi. 20–23)

1 And seeing the crowds, he went up the mountain: and when
2 he sat down, his disciples came up to him. And he opened his
mouth, and taught them, saying,

3 'Happy are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of
4 heaven. Happy are they that mourn: for they shall be com-
5 forted. Happy are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.
6 Happy are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness: for
7 they shall be satisfied. Happy are the pitiful: for they shall be
8 pitied. Happy are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.
9 Happy are the peacemakers: for they shall be called sons of God.
10 Happy are they who are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for
11 theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Happy are ye, when men revile
you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you
12 falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and exult: for great is your reward
in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets who were before
you.

3–12. The Sermon opens with a series of beatitudes. The Greek word μακάριος is the regular Septuagint translation of the Hebrew *ashre*, which means 'happy.' Sentences of the type of the beatitudes beginning 'Happy is he who does so and so,' or 'whom such and such a lot befalls,' are common in the Rabbinical literature and even in the Old Testament. The word μακάριος does not occur in Mark. In Matthew outside the Sermon on the Mount it occurs four times (xi. 6, xiii. 16, xvi. 17, xxiv. 46). In Luke outside the beatitudes it occurs ten times. The A.V. regularly translates it by 'blessed.' I have rendered it by 'happy,' but neither 'happy' nor 'blessed' is quite accurate or adequate. The happiness implied is of a particular type. It is religious happiness. But, moreover, it may be doubted how far the meaning is that the persons described as happy experience acute feelings of delight. At any rate this is not the only, and probably not the chief meaning. The main meaning probably is that they are religiously fortunate, that they enjoy, or will enjoy, a peculiar divine blessing or favour. And here lies the paradox. Those *e.g.* whom men would call unhappy, because they are persecuted are really blessed of God, possessed of his favour, and happy in the consciousness of that favour and blessing. Of the first seven beatitudes (3–9) it may be that 3, 4, 6 only belong to the original

Sermon (*i.e.* the poor in spirit, the mourners, they that hunger and thirst). These have their parallels in Luke (see below). 5 (the meek), 7 (the pitiful), 8 (the pure in heart), 9 (the peacemakers) may have been added. This is also the opinion of B. Weiss, who draws a rather subtle distinction between the character of the beatitudes of 3, 4, 6 and those of 5, 7, 8 and 9. See the notes on Luke vi. 20.

3. In Luke the words 'in spirit' are not added to 'poor.' Luke is probably more original. 'In the spirit' is probably a parenthetic addition warning the reader against a too literal interpretation of 'poor.' Poor in spirit does not mean weak in intelligence, but humble, resigned; the same class is meant as the *ani'im* and *anawim*, the poor and humble, in the Psalms. 'Their spirit is "poor," because they feel their need of God's help, and are aware that it can come from him alone' (Allen).

The verse is based on Isaiah lxi. 1. The meek in Isaiah are here the poor in spirit. The poor are not merely poor in worldly goods, though that is included, but the pious, simple folk who are, more or less, oppressed, unhappy and disappointed. The future Kingdom is to belong to them. In spite of the present tense, the meaning is that the Kingdom is still to come; the futures in the next verses make this plain.

As M. Loisy practically admits, Jesus had a bias against the rich, 'l'idée d'un riche humble et détaché se présentant comme contradictoire' (*E. S.* I. p. 546). This bias is not a merit, but a limit. It is more difficult for a rich man to be a saint than for a poor man. But it is not impossible.

The *locale* of the Kingdom is earth, but it is the renovated earth of the Messianic age.

Yet the strife still rages whether Jesus here meant to speak in this first beatitude of a present or a future Kingdom. I have assumed the second alternative. Dr Carpenter believes in the first. He says why should 'is' (ἐστί) be turned into 'shall be'? Though kingdom to us suggests territory and boundaries, and hence locality, the true sense of rule or sovereignty is independent of these spatial ideas. There was always, he thinks, a recognition of the Kingdom as a present spiritual fact both among the Rabbis and in the mind of Jesus. But J. Weiss not unreasonably points out that the Greek present tense cannot be pressed. We cannot tell whether Jesus or the Aramaic original used a perfect or a future verb, or, indeed, any verb at all. The futures in 4–7 determine the whole passage. The beatitudes show that the Kingdom is at present a heavenly treasure, which can as yet only be hoped for, yearned for, and believed in. The poor and oppressed are not happy now. They are only to be accounted happy as the heirs of a Kingdom which will assuredly be theirs. [This is perhaps not quite accurate. See below.] The Kingdom 'is' theirs only in the sense that a property may be said to belong to an heir, even before he has actually entered into possession of it. These arguments seem to me on the whole more probable than those which would seek to substantiate a present sense.

Wellhausen holds that we may distinguish several grades or stages in the (Christian) conception of the Kingdom of God, and that these stages are roughly exemplified by what we find in Mark, Matthew, and Luke respectively.

In Mark we can still discern the conception of the Kingdom as it was held and taught by Jesus himself. To him the Kingdom (which did not occupy the main place, but was rather the background, the occasion, or condition of his teaching) implied primarily (as the Day of the Lord to Amos and the older prophets) the Judgment. Hence the accurate statement of the substance of his earliest teaching in Mark i. 15: 'The Kingdom is at hand: repent.' The stress of the teaching and its originality lay in the second clause, in all the higher moral and higher religious conceptions which are implicit in true repentance. The Kingdom was in the future, though not in the distant future. The *one* means by which to escape the Judgment which ushered it in, and to enjoy its blessings, was righteousness—the higher righteousness which he felt himself called upon to preach. He did not say, 'Believe in me and enter the Kingdom,' but rather, 'Be righteous and enter it.' This attitude towards the Kingdom is predominant in Mark.

In Matthew there is a very distinct change. A second stage is visible. Jesus preaches to his community, whose existence he assumes. Jesus starts as the Messiah, and founds the Kingdom of God in his lifetime upon earth. The Kingdom is already partly realized and localized in the community. To enter the Kingdom mere righteousness is no longer enough. The essential condition is to believe in and follow Jesus, to be his disciple. The Jews, though the born heirs of the Kingdom, are excluded from it. Into their place steps another restricted body—namely, they who call themselves by the name of Jesus: that is, the Christians. It is true that not all Christians will remain in the Kingdom in its perfection. At the Judgment there will be a sifting and a selection (from many called few will be chosen). But this selection takes place within their ranks. Those outside are *ipso facto* condemned. And hence the Kingdom (as realized in the Christian community) is partly already present, though partly future.

A third stage in the development of the idea is, according to W., indicated here and there by Luke. For in Luke we occasionally find that inward, spiritualising conception which reaches its culmination in John. W. (see the note on Luke xvii. 21) adopts the rendering, 'The Kingdom of God is within you.' Thus W. can urge that Luke goes beyond Matthew when he makes Jesus say that the Kingdom is 'within' you. In that case it is emphatically, *present*; but it has its seat, not in an external organization, but in the heart. It is in accordance with this conception that Luke once or twice substitutes the Holy Spirit for the Kingdom (xi. 13 and perhaps xi. 2). Eschatological ideas are thus to some extent discouraged in him. Compare also the important addition by him of the word 'daily' in ix. 23.

The phrase 'Kingdom of heaven,' or literally, 'of the heavens,' is found in Matthew some 33 times. 'Kingdom of God' occurs some three times, and in addition we find 'Kingdom' by itself or 'his Kingdom' 'thy Kingdom' 'Kingdom of my father' and 'Kingdom of their father' 12 times more. The full list is given by Mr Allen, who seems to have omitted xiii. 33. The phrase 'Kingdom of God' occurs 14 times in Mark; Matthew five times substitutes 'Kingdom of heaven,' and eight times omits or paraphrases. On one occasion the reading is doubtful (Matt. xix. 24 = Mark x. 25), but Mr Allen strongly inclines here to the reading 'heaven.'

Out of these 48 occasions in which the Kingdom is referred to in Matthew, many obviously, or very probably, refer to the future Kingdom which was to be inaugurated when the Messianic age had come in its completion. This would be with or after the Parousia and the Judgment. *Cp.* for such usage in Matthew the passages v. 3, 10, 19 (*bis*), 20, vi. 10, 33, vii. 21, viii. 11, xiii. 43, xvi. 28, xx. 21, xxvi. 29. In other passages the Kingdom is conceived as having drawn very nigh, or as having virtually begun, with the advent of Jesus the Messiah. *Cp.* iii. 2, iv. 17, 23, ix. 35, x. 7, xii. 28. There are a further number of passages in which the Kingdom seems to be, as W. has argued, present and identified with the Christian community or church. *Cp.* xi. 11, xiii. 19, 24, 31, 33, 38, 41, 47, 52, xvi. 19, xxiii. 13. It must, however, be admitted that these passages are not very numerous, and are mainly found in chapter xiii. Probably future is the use in viii. 12, xiii. 11, 44, 45, xviii. 1, 3, 4, xix. 12, 14, 23, 24, xxi. 31, 43. Dubious passages, needing special consideration are the following: xi. 12, xviii. 23, xx. 1, xxii. 2, xxv. 1. Thus of the 48 passages, 26 are certainly or probably 'future'; six are, if not wholly future, yet not wholly present. Eleven only seem to refer pretty clearly to the existing Christian community, and in five the use is dubious. Mr Allen, in his commentary on Matthew, thinks that the phrase 'Kingdom of heaven' always and everywhere has a future signification: it means 'the Kingdom which Christ announced as at hand, to be inaugurated when the Son of man came on the clouds of heaven.' How he disposes of the eleven passages allocated above to mean the Kingdom as present or the Christian church will be seen in the notes on xi. 11 and xiii. 19. The three passages in which Matthew unquestionably has 'Kingdom of God' instead of 'Kingdom of heaven' (xii. 28, xxi. 31, 34) are given by Mr Allen a special and peculiar sense. See the notes on these passages.

It may be observed that Loisy is essentially right in saying that the formula 'Kingdom of heaven' does not mean that the Kingdom will be fulfilled in heaven. Heaven is not its *locale*. Nor will it come from heaven in the sense that it is pre-existent, and has only to descend ready made upon the earth. It is not necessary to assume that the idea of the pre-existent Kingdom was familiar to, or taught by, Jesus. 'Heaven' is a mere synonym for God.

4. For 'they that mourn' Luke has 'they that weep,' and for 'shall be comforted' he has 'shall laugh.' Harnack thinks that Matthew has the original in both cases. 'They that mourn' is based perhaps on Isaiah lxi. 2. Is not Mr Allen a little too specific in defining the mourners as those who 'mourn for the sin in Israel, which checks and thwarts God's purposes for His people, and delays the coming of the Kingdom'?

5. This verse is not in Luke, and some commentators think it is interpolated. It is mainly a quotation from Psalm xxxvii. 11. But the 'land,' says W., must be here regarded as the Kingdom, not Palestine.

J. Weiss, on the contrary, believes that the verse is authentic and in complete accordance with the dominant ideas of Jesus. The Kingdom would be realized in Palestine. Instead of the Pharisees and Rabbis being the first, in the days of the Kingdom it would be the despised outcasts, the poor, and the neglected who would inherit the land. J. Weiss raises a very important and very difficult question when he asks who are the 'poor' and the 'meek' of whom Jesus speaks. He identifies them with the 'people of the land,' the *am ha'aretz*, of whom we also hear in the Talmud. They are not synonymous with 'sinners,' or with the 'babes' of Matthew xi. 25, but yet they converge upon these. Some of them may be actual sinners in a modern, purely ethical sense; more of them, however, are sinners only in a Pharisaic, Rabbinic sense; people who cannot or will not observe the Law in its full rigours, and who therefore have fallen out of the respectable classes. They are despised by the Rabbis and Pharisees. Yet they are to the mind of Jesus the very people who are apt for religion and religious regeneration. They are all humble, even if some of them have 'sinned' ethically, and if others of them 'despair.' They would like to know God, though they hardly venture to approach him. They are child-like; they have no *arrière-pensée*; they will receive gratefully a gift and not a reward. They are those whom God loves or will love. They will hearken to the divine word, for they can receive it.

In his commentary on the Synoptic Gospels J. Weiss presses the view that the Scribes and Pharisees, the people of pattern piety, were either rich or avaricious; they turn up the nose at Jesus's praise of poverty. He asserts that, according to the 'rigid, mechanical Jewish doctrine of retribution,' this was bound to be the case, for the righteous is blessed of God, and his good fortune shows that he is blessed. From the point of view of the 'Musterfrommen' a certain 'well-to-do-ness' is a sign of piety The circle of the 'Gutgesinnten' and the circle of the 'Gutsituierten' are in general coincident.

Now it is important that readers of the Gospel should know that these allegations of J. Weiss are extremely dubious. They are particularly requested to turn to Additional Note 25 in which these statements of Weiss are discussed. Meanwhile it may be said here that there can be little doubt that even in 30 A.D. as well as in 300 A.D. there were a number of persons who were faithful observers of the Law and yet 'poor' and 'meek.' One may safely go further and say that among the Pharisees and the Rabbis there were many who, on the one hand, were strict legalists, on the other hand were poor and meek. But I do not deny that there were also in existence in Galilee, in 30 A.D., a certain number of people who answered to the description given by Weiss. Only it would be a gross perversion of the facts to assume that the poor and the meek were limited to this class, and that there were not very many faithful observers of the Law who were both poor and meek.

6. Luke omits 'after righteousness.' He means a literal hunger, and this was doubtless the original form. 'Righteousness' and 'righteous' (δικαιοσύνη and δίκαιος) are somewhat favourite words of Matthew. He contrasts the supposed higher 'righteousness' of the Gospel with the supposed lower righteousness of the Law, and in doing so he shows considerable partiality. To go to Matthew, or, indeed, to any New Testament book, for a true account of Rabbinic 'righteousness,' is like looking for a true account of the Roman Catholic religion in a Protestant tract. Both Roman Catholicism and Protestantism have their specific excellences, but these cannot be found in the partisan descriptions of the one by the other.

J. Weiss disputes that Luke has here the original form. He thinks that the words 'for righteousness' were omitted by Luke because Luke one-sidedly emphasizes the mere outward condition of want and oppression of the early Christian disciples. The meaning of the phrase 'to hunger after righteousness' he takes to be, not a longing to be good in our modern and merely ethical sense, but a longing to be held righteous, to be justified by God. Such a justification would come to those who now yearn for it with the new age or at the general Judgment. J. Weiss compares the Psalmic prediction that the 'righteousness' of the afflicted shall be made manifest at the Judgment or Messianic era (*cp.* Ps. xxxvii. 6). The poor sinners and outcasts—they who do not and cannot observe the Law—nevertheless yearn for God's grace, and they hope that God will justify them and recognize them as righteous in a truer and purer sense, for they only want to draw near to God, and they throw themselves upon His mercy. All this sounds well, but it is scarcely historic.

7. Not in Luke. M. Loisy has a curious note here. Throughout his otherwise admirable commentary, he seems to show that he has read very few of the numerous books which give some of the Rabbinic parallels to Gospel teaching, or of the books which tell of the inner history of the Jews. He seems everywhere dependent upon Schürer, never quotes Jewish authors, and appears ignorant of Rabbinical literature. He says: 'Jewish opinion, which readily saw in every misfortune the punishment of a personal fault, did not favour pity' (*E. S.* I. p. 549). This is a very strange sentence, and it would be interesting to know what evidence M. Loisy could adduce for this utterance. He does not usually libel the Jewish religion, but libel this assertion certainly is. The doctrine to which he alludes did play a considerable part in Jewish ethics and religion; but compassion, pity, charity (whether with strict consistency or not) played a larger part still. There is no sentence in the New Testament which sounds more obvious, and even commonplace, to every Jew than this one. Compassion to those in distress was a characteristic of Rabbinic Judaism and of the Rabbinic Jew.

8. Not in Luke. The verse is made up of Psalms xi. 7 and xxiv. 4.

9. Not merely peaceable, but makers of peace. 'Sons of God' means here inheritors of the Kingdom. *Cp.* Luke xx. 36

10-12. 'Falsely,' *ψευδόμενοι*. The word is wanting in some MSS. and versions and should probably be omitted.

For ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, 'for my sake,' S.S. has 'because of my name.' Merx thinks this is original; it means, 'because of your personal relation to me.' This seems dubious.

'For so persecuted they the prophets who were before you.' S.S. reads with Luke: 'For so their fathers persecuted the prophets.' This Merx prefers. But Harnack thinks that Matthew has the original text throughout 11 and 12, except that he would omit 'for my sake' (ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ). 11, 12 correspond with Luke vi. 22, 23.

The verses seem later than Jesus, though perhaps written in his spirit. They seem to reflect the first persecutions of the Christians at the hands of the Jews. But Harnack is intensely keen to keep all the main beatitudes (common to Luke and Matthew and hence taken from Q) as the utterance of Jesus: *i.e.* verses 3, 4, 6, 10–12. Not everything he urges which *might* be the result of subsequent events is therefore necessarily to be regarded as such a result. Why could Jesus not have said: 'Happy are ye when they revile and persecute and falsely speak all manner of evil about you.' 'Das muss ja bereits bei Lebzeiten Jesu die Jünger immer wieder und in den verschiedensten Formen betroffen haben, und es ist gar nicht abzusehen wie Jesus daran vorübergegangen sein kann' (*Sprüche und Reden*, p. 143). With all respect to the distinguished German theologian, his argument seems to me exceedingly dubious. What good evidence is there that the disciples of Jesus or Jesus himself were persecuted in the Galilæan period? For my own part I should think it very doubtful. Mark gives us the impression that Jesus might have had to undergo some adverse criticism, but not anything like what we should call persecution. There was somewhat more freedom of discussion and opinion in those days than is generally admitted. Even B. Weiss (*Quellen*, B, p. 5) admits that the last half of verse 11 may be an addition of Matthew, reflecting the special events of his age and environment.

The persecuted may rejoice because their heavenly reward will be great. It is already prepared and ready for them. They may also rejoice in that they are the true successors of the prophets who were persecuted of old.

The morality is of the eudæmonistic order and familiar enough. Present sufferings are only the prelude to future glory and happiness. But there is a higher note also. There is a touch of passion and enthusiasm; a certain pride in suffering for the cause of righteousness and truth.

If 11 and 12 make one beatitude, and 5 is interpolated, one gets the sacred number of seven. In Luke there are only four. W., comparing the versions of Luke and Matthew together, acutely remarks: 'In Luke the human subjects of the beatitudes enter the Kingdom, not because of that which they are and do, but because of that which they suffer and want. In place of these sufferings and renouncements we have in Matthew mainly inward qualities or tendencies, through which men make themselves worthy of the Kingdom or strive towards it. In Luke there is a clear-cut contrast between the misery of the present and the joy of the future; in Matthew this future is already being formed in the hearts of the elect. Doubtless inward conditions are also presupposed in Luke, but they are not expressly stated. Luke's variations from Matthew are always to be preferred. Matthew moralised the beatitudes, made seven of them, and enlarged their application beyond the disciples to all who possess the needful qualifications. Only in v. 11, 12 has Matthew kept the original. For there the disciples are specially addressed, and they are not promised reward for their virtues, but for the persecutions which they have undergone.'

The beatitudes form a suitable and noble opening for the great Sermon. They set the note for all that is to follow. They pitch the key. We are to hear about the right morality and the true religion for those who are to be 'happy' in their poverty and affliction, and 'happy' in their meekness and mercy.

And if we choose rather to adopt Luke's version of the beatitudes in verses 3 and 6, we may not unjustifiably divide the whole number in some such way as B. Weiss does, and then we can discern a certain community of spirit in either group. Verses 3, 4, 6 and 10 will form one group and 5, 7, 8 and 9 the other. Each group has its own special tone. And whatever the number of the original beatitudes may have been, it may reasonably be urged that all of them are welcome and suitable, and that both groups are in keeping with the Sermon as a whole.

The first group is perhaps the more striking and original. At first sight the originality may not be noticed, but it is nevertheless there. We have but to put the stress in the right place. For whatever the reasons given for the assertion that certain classes of persons are happy, the emphasis is upon the fact that they are so. It may be that the reason for their present happiness is their future 'reward': nevertheless, the fact remains of their justified happiness in the present. And in this present happiness lies the originality of these beatitudes. Moreover, the happiness is something more than ordinary happiness. If 'blessed' is a not quite accurate, 'happy' is a not quite adequate, rendering. 'Blissful' might be better; *selig* is the more sufficing German translation.

To comfort those who are now poor, or hungry, or mournful, or persecuted, is one thing. But to tell them that they not only *will be* happy, but are, or should feel themselves, really and truly, happy *now*, this is quite another thing. To tell them that they ought positively to be glad and rejoice in their misfortunes struck a new note—a note of great significance and power, a note which was to have great consequences of far-reaching importance. To rejoice in martyrdom, to seek it out, this was promoted by the beatitudes. Not merely to endure a life of hardship bravely, but to rejoice in it and to seek it out, this too has been the product of the beatitudes. And these notes and excellences have been, it must be acknowledged, distinctive of Christianity and of its saints and apostles and martyrs. And doubtless many thousands of humble sufferers have risen superior to their troubles and afflictions through the memory and influence of the beatitudes.

Similarly, as regards the second set of the beatitudes, though perhaps with less originality. The meek, the merciful, the pure in heart, the peacemaker: these are not only to reap reward in the future: they are to feel happy *now*. For only in the highest goodness lies the highest rapture.

It may also be observed that the 'eudæmonism' of the beatitudes is of a special kind. They do not say, 'Do this, or be this, *because* you will gain a reward,' or, 'do not do this *because* you will be punished.' But they say, 'A certain line of action, a certain disposition of mind bring happiness now and hereafter.' The result follows necessarily from the cause. It is the law of God. 'Heaven' and happiness follow as certainly from goodness, as their opposites follow from wickedness. The one is not an arbitrarily added reward; the other is not an arbitrarily added punishment. The result is contained in the premiss, as surely as the result of health-giving medicines or death-dealing drugs is already contained within them. The bliss of virtue, both 'now' and 'hereafter,' is a continuous state, and not a something added *ad extra* to form a reward: and *mutatis mutandis*, the same may be said of vice. Thus the sting of the supposed 'eudæmonism' is removed.

13–16. THE SALT AND THE LIGHT

(*Cp.* Luke xiv. 34, 35, xi. 33, viii. 16)

3 'Ye are the salt of the earth: but if salt lose its savour,
wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing,
4 except to be thrown away and trodden under men's feet. Ye are
the light of the world. A city that lieth on a mountain cannot
5 be hidden. Neither do men light a lamp, and put it under the
bushel, but upon the lampstand; and it giveth light unto all that
6 are in the house. Even so let your light shine before men, that

they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven.

The connection is not quite easy. Loisy supposes that the Evangelist thought as follows: 'the disciples of Jesus ought all the less to allow themselves to be frightened by persecution, inasmuch as they are, by their very calling, destined to exercise over other men a nobler and healthier influence.' (*E. S.* I. p. 554.)

The metaphor of the salt and of the lamp occur both in Luke and in Mark. It may be presumed that both were found in Q, but whether Mark's versions are also dependent upon Q is in dispute.

13. *Cp.* Mark ix. 50, which W. regards as the original. B. Weiss on the contrary thinks that 13 stood somewhere in Q, as well as 14*b* and 15, 16. Harnack limits Q's share to 13 and 15, in the same form as we now find them in Matthew. Perhaps, as M. Loisy thinks, the first use of the 'salt' metaphor was more simple than that now found in either Mark or Matthew. The disciple who loses the spirit of discipleship is as useless as salt which has lost its saltness. This idea was then by Matthew enlarged. As salt is to food in general, so should the disciple, or the Christians, be to the world. They are to make it, as it were, palatable to God; they are to give a higher religion and morality to the world. In this form the salt metaphor is later than Jesus.

14–16. Here we seem to have much the same idea as is expressed in the metaphor of the salt. The Christian must not live for himself. He must be seen and show himself, as much as a city which is on the top of a hill. The same conception is put forward in the metaphor of the light and the lamp. The good deeds and life of the disciples, or of Christians, must be a shining light and example to the world. Mark iv. 21 employs the metaphor for the teaching of Jesus which W. regards as an older use. Luke has the metaphor twice, once from Mark (viii. 16), once from Q (xi. 33). Though Matthew's use of the metaphor is later than Mark's, this is no conclusive argument for the relative dates of Q and Mark. Mark may even have taken the adage from Q. The original meaning may have been what Loisy suggests, namely, that the Kingdom of heaven will ultimately, as it were, be visible all over the world. The Gospel is proclaimed in a corner; its fulfilment will be wide and general.

17–20. JESUS'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE LAW

(*Cp.* Luke xvi. 17)

17 'Think not that I came to destroy the Law or the Prophets:
18 I came not to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you,
Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no
19 wise pass away from the Law, till all be fulfilled. Whoever then
annulleth one of these least commandments, and teacheth men so,
he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven: but whoever
doeth and teacheth them, he shall be called great in the kingdom
20 of heaven. For I say unto you, That unless your righteousness
exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in
no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven.

We now come to a main, if not the main, portion of the whole, or of the original, Sermon—the relation of the morality and religion of Jesus to the morality and religion of the Law, or, rather, it should perhaps be said, the relation of the teaching of Jesus to that of the Scribes. It will be remembered that B. Weiss would limit the original Sermon to this subject entirely: Jesus's polemic against the *interpretation* of the Law by the Scribes in particular and its *fulfilment* by the Pharisees in general. The first part is treated of from v. 17 down to v. 48, with the omission of 23—26, 29, 30. It consists of an introduction giving the main principle, the standpoint or theory, in which Jesus looks at the Law, and of a detailed application of that theory or standpoint in six examples.

Yet the introduction, with the main principle or theory, is as we shall see full of difficulties. It seems to say that the standpoint of Jesus is not that he desires to abolish the Law, but to deepen it, and in that sense to fulfil or complete it. The righteousness of the Law, so far as the mere letter goes, is inadequate for the disciples or for the Christian. To enter into the new Kingdom a higher righteousness is required. The commands of the Law are not far-reaching enough. Jesus in one sense makes them more severe. His interpretation adds largely to their scope and depth. The disciple must do not only what the Law says, but what it implies. And it implies far more, according to the new legislator, than what it says. Yet though one can interpret the introduction to mean this, when we come to details and to the separate verses, many difficulties appear. In the form in which we now find them, it is not wholly certain whether Jesus ever said any of these four verses. Only verse 18 has a parallel in Luke.

First, then, as to verse 17. For the form of it we may compare x. 34. The essence of the verse lies in the last word of it, 'to fulfil,' *πληρῶσαι*. Is the 'fulfilment' here spoken of an idea which could have occurred to Jesus? Does it suggest later theories and conflicts? We know that from Paul onwards the relation of the youthful Church to the Law was for some time a burning question. Did the Church recognize the divinity of the Law? Did it accept its validity? Had Jesus maintained or annulled it? We know how one view was that the Law was indeed divine, but that Christians need not observe it. Nevertheless Jesus had not destroyed the Law, but fulfilled it in a higher and spiritual sense. And 'fulfil' may be here used in a Pauline sense which would be later than, and unfamiliar to, Jesus. On the other hand, in some perhaps simpler form, Jesus may have said that he did not want to annul the law, but to deepen it, to give it a wider application than the ordinary Scribe understood. He did not want to abolish the law, 'Thou shalt not murder.' But he wanted to make it include all sorts of things which were not understood to fall within its range. He wanted to make the prohibition of adultery include the lustful thought as well as the lustful deed.

But this interpretation of fulfilment is not without its difficulty. For though it works as regards some of the examples, it does not work as regards others. Jesus says, 'Do not swear at all.' How can that be a 'fulfilment' in the sense described of the Law? Again Jesus says, 'Resist not evil.' How is that a fulfilment of 'an eye for an eye'? 'Fulfil' would have to be used, at any rate, in a somewhat loose sense to apply to these examples, and it can only with difficulty be maintained that the new teaching does not 'annul' or disavow or traverse the old.

M. Loisy is uncertain whether to regard 17 as authentic or not. He says: 'Had Jesus occasion thus to define his position with regard to the Law? It may be believed without presumption that under no circumstances could he or did he do so in the systematic and scholastic manner of the Sermon as we have it now, by first establishing an universal principle, and afterwards enumerating the different applications of which this principle admitted. The pronouncements with regard to the kinds of injustice forbidden, with regard to retaliation, oaths and love of enemies could and must have been made on special occasions, as in the case of divorce. But it is conceivable that in the collection of his speeches all these declarations were placed under a common head, without regard to, and omitting, the circumstances in which they were pronounced. The origin and character of the Sermon are in keeping with the idea that the redactor is responsible for this common head (*cette raison commune*); nevertheless, this hypothesis is not necessary, the general principle having possibly been formulated by Jesus himself on some particular occasion, with regard to the Sabbath, for example, or to his manner of dealing with the precepts relating to legal defilement, or to one of the subjects touched upon in the Sermon. Not only is it possible that he was accused of overthrowing the Law, but the conclusion seems inevitable that this accusation was made more than once, if not early in the Galilæan ministry, at all events later on and towards the end. To this accusation Jesus could have made no other reply than that attributed to him, and which it is therefore permissible to accept as authentic, namely, as with regard to divorce, that he had not come to destroy the Law, but to perfect it in conformity with the will of the supreme Lawgiver expressed in the sacred writings. Thus he did not abrogate the Law; he found in it the purpose of God, the will of Providence' (*E. S.* I. p. 563).

We can indeed hardly expect to get to any certain conclusion as to Jesus's theoretic attitude towards the Law, because he probably had not faced the question himself. He may have been inconsistent without being aware of it. In all probability he observed the Mosaic Law himself, and did not directly urge or desire his disciples to break any definite injunction. But with his pure and intense ethical and religious insight, with his prophetic conception of religion, like another Amos or Hosea, some of the laws, perhaps only half consciously to himself, may have caused him trouble. There was so much ritual and outwardness in some of them; and if they did not encourage formalism and hypocrisy, they sometimes opened the way to these vices, which were specially repugnant to him. Even the Rabbinic literature is quite aware that these vices are the dangers of a legal religion. Every religion has its special dangers.

Nevertheless it is easier to suppose that Jesus, if he spoke of 'fulfilling the Law,' was referring (as in the examples which are to follow in the Sermon) to the moral rather than to the ceremonial part of the Law. It is not easy to see how he can have regarded his great saying about inward purity as such a fulfilment, as M. Loisy supposes. Rather would he have uttered this great saying in momentary forgetfulness that it really did not fulfil, but traversed the Law.

For two things are greatly forgotten by the ordinary Christian commentator. The first is that sentences like Matthew xxii. 40, quoted by M. Loisy, prove little or nothing by themselves. One could quote close parallels to them from the Rabbis. For the edification and needs of the moment a Rabbi would often use words which would seem to imply a 'fulfilment' of the Law by an ignoring of its details; but he would have been very much surprised if he had been asked by a pupil, 'May I then eat a rabbit?' Moreover, the Rabbis habitually 'fulfilled' the Law in the same sort of way as Jesus fulfils it in his remarks about adultery and anger, which are singularly Jewish and Rabbinic; but, because they well knew the difference between legal enactments and ethical perfection, they did not mean to imply that the legal enactment was not to be observed.

Secondly, some commentators do not seem to understand what the divineness of the Law means. It is all very well for a modern critic with his comfortable distinctions between letter and spirit, human element and divine element, and so on. These were quite unknown in Jewish society in the age of Christ. If you believed that the Law was divine, you believed that it was all divine, and not only a few sentences here and there; you took the Law at its own valuation. The Law does not claim to be divine here and human there, permanent in one place and transitory in another. It is *all* divine and *all* permanent. God ordered the Jews not to eat rabbits every bit as much as He ordered them not to murder or to commit adultery. He ordered them not to wear a garment of linen and woollen every bit as much as He ordered them to show justice and pity to the orphan and the widow. If Jesus showed any hesitation in admitting this, or rather if his teaching was even inconsistent with it, the Rabbis, with their acute logic, could easily have exposed him. But I fancy that Jesus would hardly have agreed with some of the things which are said about him. For instance, M. Loisy says that Jesus, 'sans rompre avec la loi, la domine de si haut qu'elle n'existe plus pour lui' (*E. S.* I. p. 569). If the Law was in Jesus's eyes divine, it is impossible that 'it did not exist for him.' The modern and especially the liberal Christian critic finds it rather hard to understand what a *divine* law really means to anyone who honestly believes it to be divine.

There is a view which would attempt to explain the attitude of Jesus towards the Law (1) by emphasizing the fact that he was a native of Galilee, and (2) by arguing that it is not right to assume that the intense reverence for the Law which existed universally among the Jews of (say) 300 A.D. was necessarily universal among all classes of Jewish society in (say) 30 A.D. Schmidt, for instance, says: 'Galilee was notorious for what were regarded in Jerusalem as laxer conceptions. Jesus probably believed that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch. Yet he found in the prophetic rolls the most pointed criticism of the cult. Prophets had in the name of God spoken against sacrifices, temples, sabbaths, and other ordinances of the Law. The entire evangelic tradition shows that Jesus was deeply influenced by the Prophets, but can at no time have had any great interest in the Law. To draw a picture of Jewish society in general at the beginning of our era from the discussion of lawyers in the Talmud is not only to read back later ideas and traditions into an earlier age, but to do injustice by a false generalization to a national life that freely developed in many directions.' (To this sentence Schmidt appends a splendidly independent and cogent footnote, which I gladly and gratefully quote: 'In addition to this false generalization, there often appears a shockingly one-sided and unjust estimate of the type of religious life revealed by Rabbinic literature. This sectarianism, which can only be overcome by a sounder historic method and a long training in objective yet sympathetic treatment of different religious phenomena, still disfigures many a work of great erudition and liberal tendencies.') To the two arguments so far adduced, Schmidt adds a third drawn from the attitude (a curious mixture of independence and veneration) of the Essenes towards the Law. 'Whether there was any relation between the Essenes and Jesus or not, the fact is significant that these most pious members of the nation did not regard it as necessary to wait for a Messiah to authorise a remarkably free attitude toward the Law and the Temple service' (*Prophet of Nazareth*, p. 110). The evidence for these three arguments and their value for the question at issue are discussed in Additional Note 34.

If 17 is authentic, it does not follow that 18 and 19 are authentic too. J. Weiss is inclined to regard all the three as interconnected, but later than Jesus and later than Paul. He points out that the Evangelist does not say 'to fulfil the Law,' but, generally, 'to fulfil,' without a specific object. The new law of Jesus stands to the old Law of Moses in the same relation as a fulfilment stands to a prediction. But it is not implied that the old Law is to exist *after* 'all has been fulfilled' (18). Till the Judgment, when the old earth and the old heaven shall pass away, the old Law is to abide. It is binding upon all the community till that not distant period. Mr Allen says with force and directness about 18 and 19: 'Commentators have exhausted their ingenuity in attempts to explain away this passage, but its meaning is too clear to be misunderstood. Christ is here represented as speaking in the spirit of Alexandrine and Rabbinical Judaism. The attitude to the Law here described is inconsistent with the general tenor of the Sermon. Verses 21–48 are clearly intended to explain and illustrate the way in which Christ fulfilled the Law. But they describe a fulfilment which consists in a penetrating insight into the true moral principles underlying the enactments of the Mosaic code, and verses 34, 39 directly traverse two propositions of the Law. Fulfilment in this sense is something very different from the fulfilment which rests upon the idea of the permanent authority of the least commandment of the Law.' Mr Allen is too cautious, however, to regard 18 and 19 as the composition of the editor. For he goes on to say: 'It seems probable therefore that 18 and 19 did not originally belong to the Sermon, but have been placed here by the editor, who has thus given to fulfil (= to bring into clear light the true scope and meaning) a sense (viz. to reaffirm and carry out in detail) which is foreign to the general tenor of the Sermon. Verse 18 finds a parallel in an artificial context in Luke xvi. 17. It is therefore a well authenticated traditional utterance of Christ. Both it and 19 may well have been spoken by him on different occasions, and under circumstances which made his meaning clear, as hyperbolical expressions of respect for the authority of the general tenor and purport of the Law.'

On the whole 18 and 19 seem inconsistent with the attitude of Jesus to the Law taken as a whole. M. Loisy is probably right in regarding them as interpolated (see further below). As regards 20 see the note on that verse.

17. 'I came.' The word, says J. Weiss, wears an almost Johannine look, but this is exaggerated. *Cp.* Mark ii. 17. 'I came' means merely, 'I was sent by God.'

'The Prophets.' 'The reference to the Prophets seems out of place. It is the Law alone which is taken into consideration in the rest of the chapter. The editor has probably added "or the Prophets," in view of the fact that, according to Christ's teaching elsewhere, Prophets and Law alike (*i.e.* the whole Old Testament) found their fulfilment in Him' (Allen).

πληρῶσαι. As Holtzmann observes, the word can either be interpreted, relative to 19, to mean 'carrying out,' 'accomplishing' (so too in iii. 15), or, relative to 20, to mean making the incomplete complete, making the inadequate righteousness of the mere letter of the Law deeper and more adequate. In this sense to complete the Law might mean to idealize it, and by idealizing it transcend it. It seems, however, very doubtful whether Jesus would have fashioned this somewhat theoretic or philosophic conception of his attitude towards the Law. A tolerably long development was probably needed, including the labour and thought of Paul, to reach this conception, which is in a sense both conservative and radical. Whatever you retain from the Law, and whatever you give up of it, can be equally regarded as the higher fulfilment of it.

18. This is the verse which occurs also in Luke xvi. 17 and may come from Q. The two 'untils' are very awkward. M. Loisy supposes that the second is an addition made by Matthew to his source. Matthew was keen on typological fulfilments, which are here rather out of place. This view supposes that 'till all is fulfilled' refers to prophecies. It is usually referred to the Law itself; 'till all that it demands shall be accomplished.' But the sense remains rather strained, and the words are very hard to explain. Perhaps they mean, as J. Weiss supposes, 'till all this world's life is over, till the Judgment.' Harnack holds that the opinion about the Law expressed in this verse was the actual opinion of Jesus. There is no parallel to it in Mark. There, on the contrary, we have xiii. 31 ('Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away'). Harnack bravely adds: 'Will mann diesen Spruch zum Vergleich heranziehen—und dass zwingt sich fast auf—so kann kein Zweifel sein, wo das Sekundäre zu suchen ist' (*loc. cit.* p. 145). As to the wording Harnack holds that the text of Matthew is correct as against Luke. [W. has just the opposite opinion.] Luke says that the Law shall last longer than (the present) heaven and earth. 'Das ist die echte hellenistische Hochschätzung des A.T.'s bei Lukas, die so hoch sein konnte, weit sie theoretisch war und ausserhalb der praktischen Kämpfe stand' (*Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, p. 43). But the last words, 'till all be fulfilled,' were probably added, he thinks, by Matthew, partly because fulfilment had been spoken of in the previous verse, and partly by reminiscence of Mark xiii. 30. 'Not passing away' (as regards the Law) means simply 'remain in force.'

'One jot,' *ἰῶτα ἕν*. That is one *Yod*, the smallest letter in the Hebrew alphabet. It has been suggested that *Yod* was not smaller in the writing of that time than *Vau*. Perhaps Matthew added *ἰῶτα* (*i*) as the smallest letter of the Greek alphabet.

κεραία is supposed to refer to the small strokes or hooks which at that time served to distinguish letters which otherwise closely resembled each other (*i.e.* ו and ב *v* and *b*, or בּ and כּ *b* and *k*, or ה and ח *h* and *ch*).

19. There seems to be a polemical reference to the followers of Paul. They are not excluded from the Kingdom, but they are to occupy the lowest place. The Kingdom is not here the Kingdom in its old eschatological sense, but apparently it is the Christian Church. In such a sense the Kingdom was not used by Jesus himself. How unlike is this verse to xxii. 40, says Loisy.

Pfleiderer thinks that 19 is probably a later addition, but that 17 and 18 are, if not in the actual wording, genuine expressions of Jesus's actual teaching. That 18 occurs also in Luke xvi. 17

shows at any rate that it must rest on pretty old tradition. Moreover, the oldest 'Church' before Paul followed a rule of life in accordance with it. 17 and 18, or their original form, were meant by Jesus quite simply to indicate the perpetual binding force of the Mosaic Law. The Evangelist meant to indicate something different. He meant that the Law was to be 'fulfilled' spiritually and morally. He wants, like Luke, to preserve the due mean between antinomianism on the one hand and *ceremonial* legalism on the other. 'Fulfil' and 'destroy' are Pauline expressions, and were doubtless employed by the Evangelist in a Pauline sense (*Urchristentum*, Vol. I. p. 564).

Merx has a long, learned and most ingenious disquisition on 17–19. It would be impossible here even to summarize his arguments or to indicate the learning upon which they are based. They however rest not only upon learning, but as it seems to me upon the desire to increase the originality of Jesus, to widen the gap which separated him from all contemporary and previous Jewish thought. Nevertheless the arguments are so clear and learned and profound, that the results must be given. The original reading of 17–19 was something like this: 'Do not think that I have come to annul any law (or the Law); I have not come to annul, but to complete; verily I say unto you, one letter shall not pass from the Law till all has happened. He then who annuls one of these smallest laws, and so teaches men, shall be called least in the Kingdom. For I say unto you that unless your righteousness exceed,' &c.

It will be noted that the words, 'or the Prophets' are omitted in 17. The whole question concerns Jesus's attitude to the Law, not to the Prophets. Next for καταλῦσαι ('destroy') is read as in 19, λῦσαι ('annul'). Perhaps for τὸν νόμον, 'the Law,' should be read νόμον, 'a law.'

Then Merx asks, what did Jesus mean by 'annul'? He meant what the Jews meant by 'binding and loosing,' namely, 'forbidding and allowing.' He was not concerned with these practical details. He would not disturb or annul the smallest law. He had far higher work to do. He had to complete the Law, *i.e.* to substitute for it his own higher righteousness. But the Law must go on till all has happened. This does not mean till the Law has been fulfilled, but till the Kingdom has been established. Then the Law will cease. He who, like the Scribes, worries himself by 'loosing' any small law can only expect a very low grade in the Kingdom.

The strong point in this interpretation seems to be its explanation of ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται, 'till all has happened,' 'till all is fulfilled,' which is a strange expression as applied to the Law.

Merx's arguments as to the gradual expansion and mutilation of the text and the reasons for this are highly ingenious and learned. But as a whole the theory and rendering will hardly stand.

Loisy's view as regards 17–19 may be summarized as follows: 17 as I have already mentioned he regards as probably authentic, when understood in the sense which he has given to it. See above. The author of verses 18 and 19 (which are not authentic), who is earlier than Matthew, for Matthew found the two verses substantially in his source, understood the fulfilment of the Law in 17 to mean that 'exécution minutieuse de toutes les prescriptions légales' which originally, and to Jesus, it did not mean at all. Finally the Evangelist understood by fulfilment an accomplishment of prophecies and of types. Thus the first compiler added 18 and 19, but to 18 the Evangelist made his own addition, namely the words 'until all be fulfilled,' 'till all has happened,' ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται. By these words he referred to a prophetic and typological fulfilment of passages in the Law. Verse 19 is the work of the first compiler, and means what it says. Those who disobey the minutest precepts of the Law will not be wholly excluded from the Kingdom, but they will occupy in it the last and the lowest place.

It may be noted that even 17 could not have been spoken except at a fairly late period in the ministry. Who would have thought at first that Jesus came to destroy the Law? In fact the verse gives one the impression of being a fine theoretic reflection of a later thinker upon Jesus's attitude. Jesus himself was hardly so theoretic. He took his line towards the Law as occasion demanded. W. says: 'die Stellungnahme des neuen Gesetzgebers zum Gesetz der Alten war die brennende Frage des jungen Christentums. Bei Marcus x. 1–10 berührt Jesus sie nur gelegentlich, aber ganz unbefangen. Bei Mt. greift er sie gleich in seiner ersten Rede principiell an, aber viel befangener.'

20. This verse follows awkwardly. Some would connect it with 17; 18 and 19 being interpolated. Or again it might be a sort of qualification to 18 and 19, added on by somebody who disliked the point of view of these two verses and wanted to minimize their tendency. The 'righteousness' of the Gospel is contrasted with the presumed 'outward' righteousness of the Scribes. Moreover the Kingdom seems here used in its older, more eschatological sense. Mr Allen too would let 20 follow on 17. The two verses taken thus together mean: 'I did not come, as you might think, to overthrow the authority of the Law of Moses. In its general scope and purport, its authority, as an expression of the divine will, is permanent. I came to fulfil it by emphasizing its

true meaning, and as being the Messiah whom it dimly foreshadowed.' (This last clause seems unlikely.) 'So far from depreciating it, I tell you that your "righteousness" must be more fundamental than the "righteousness" of the Scribes and Pharisees, based not upon external adherence to the letter of the Law, but upon insight into the principles which underlie it.' W. holds that 20 is later than 18, 19; it is wanting in D. 18 is at least as old as the common special source of Matthew and Luke (Q). 18 plus 32 equal Luke xvi. 17, 18. The prohibition of divorce makes the Law more stringent and therefore fulfils it.

J. Weiss thinks that 20 may (in Q) originally have followed 10. It gives the true theme of the original 'Sermon': namely, the higher righteousness which is the condition of entering the Kingdom. But we cannot be at all sure that 20 existed in Q. Loisy's view, as we have seen, is that 18, 19 as well as 17 were found in Q, though Luke only used 18. These last two verses represent the attitude of the Jewish-Christians towards Paul. Pauline Christianity is not regarded as an absolute error, worthy of eternal reprobation, but as an inferior form of truth and perfection. On the other hand it is the Evangelist who does the best he can with 18 and 19 by adding 20. It does not really follow on 17; 18 and 19 were not intercalated between an already existing 17 plus 20. For verse 20 really refers to 19, and is intended to soften it. To enter into the Kingdom, a man must fulfil the Law in its full ideal completeness. Both big commands and small commands must be fulfilled. The connection is artificial, but intentional. The Evangelist 'n'entendait pas, il ne voulait pas qu'on entendît la négligence et l'observation des menus préceptes par rapport à la lettre de la loi; il a tiré le meilleur parti possible d'un texte qu'il ne croyait par devoir omettre, et dont la signification réelle le déconcertait' (*E. S.* I. p. 567). This seems well argued, but the complete accuracy of the last sentence may be doubtful. For there may be an intended reference to the big and the little commandments. The Pharisees strain after the little ones and forget the big ones. The disciples must especially fulfil the big ones, and then their righteousness will exceed the righteousness of the Pharisees, and enable them to enter into the Kingdom of heaven.

The higher righteousness of Jesus, his new commandments, are, as J. Weiss rightly says, intended for men who are soon to appear before the judgment seat of God. The sermon is spoken from the point of view of an expected and near 'end of the world.' The crisis is at hand. Hence the Sermon contains no programme for the improvement of this world and its institutions. It has no thought of a human race who are to live upon the earth for centuries upon centuries, but it is spoken to a small band of men who are to turn their backs upon earthly matters, and to expect and prepare for a new 'heavenly' order. We can find in the Sermon no solution of our 'social question,' no plans upon which to organize the society of later ages. To the question, 'How are we best to order the life of mankind?' we receive no answer; what is answered is the question which an earnest and tender conscience must always put to itself: 'What must I do to be saved?' It is this quality of the Sermon—here rightly, if perhaps too one-sidedly, emphasized by Weiss—which makes a certain distinction between the ethics of Jesus and the ethics of the prophets. We can see how the teaching of Jesus could be misinterpreted to justify and to lead to a selfish individualism. For the question 'What must I do to be saved?' ('Was muss ich tun dass ich selig werde?') can lead and has led to unsocial and wasteful asceticism, to morbid introspection, to a selfish and egoistic charity which has increased the evils which it professedly would cure. 'What must I do to be saved?' is a question which to Jewish ears has often a selfish and over-personal sound. It is sometimes said that distinctively Jewish ethics say: 'What is my duty towards others for their benefit?' and that distinctively Christian ethics say: 'What is my duty towards others that I may save my own soul?' The antithesis is really a false one, and the teaching of Jesus, taken as a whole, is free from all egoistic taint. Nevertheless, just as Rabbinic religion has its peculiar dangers, so has the religion of the Synoptic Gospels.

21, 22. THE OLD LAW AND THE NEW TEACHING: (A) OF ANGER

(Not in Luke)

21 'Ye have heard that it was said to the men of old time, Thou
shalt do no murder; and whoever doeth murder shall be liable to
22 the court. But I say unto you, That whoever is angry with his
brother shall be liable to the court: and whoever shall say to his
brother, *Raca*, shall be liable to the high court; and whoever
shall say, Thou fool, shall be liable to the Gehenna of fire.

21. We now are shown in detail how the new 'gospel' righteousness must exceed the old 'legal' righteousness and differ from it. The first of the contrasts between the old Law and the new teaching deals with murder and wrath. Five or six times it is said, 'Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time,

so and so, but I say unto you'—something finer and deeper. Though the Law of Moses is not definitely mentioned, the artifice of omission does not succeed. For clearly the references can only allude to the Decalogue and the Mosaic Law. It was the Decalogue in which it was said, 'Thou shalt not kill,' 'Thou shalt not commit adultery.'

It can hardly be doubted that we must distinguish in these 'contrasts' what was contributed by Jesus and what was contributed by a later writer. The latter was more hostile to the Law than Jesus, and certainly more deliberately opposed to Judaism. For, as W. says: 'Presumably the words of the Law are supposed to be the same thing as the Jewish religion, and yet the Jewish religion had, in many respects, advanced as much beyond the literal words of the Law as the Christian religion. The foil is darkened, that the light may shine more brightly.' This is a very pleasant concession from W.! [What a surrender, if unconscious, of the old position that every real and implied attack in the Gospels upon Judaism is accurate and historic! *E pur si muove!*] 'We have the echo of a temper which was produced among the disciples by the crucifixion and by the persecutions which they had to undergo.' [W. adds a more questionable statement, unless we assume that passages like v. 18, 19 are from Matthew's own hand, and not from his sources.] 'As a Jerusalem scribe, Matthew is much more Jewish (*steckt viel tiefer im Judentum*) than Jesus of Galilee, but he nevertheless criticises his hostile fellow-countrymen, and especially their spiritual leaders, more sharply. He oscillates between two opposite poles.' I hardly think it possible that Jesus would have set his teaching (for that is what it comes to) in contrast to the Decalogue. He would scarcely have wished to depreciate the Decalogue by the higher nobility of his own teaching. Nor can I think that he would have wished his disciples to believe that the Decalogue was a poor and meagre sort of law, which it was reserved for him to deepen and to enlarge.

Very ingenious is the hypothesis of Dr Schechter, based upon a profound and also instinctive knowledge of Rabbinic and Hebrew usage, which is wanting to the Christian commentators. Dr Schechter shows that the Rabbis were accustomed to give enlarged interpretations of Biblical utterances, and were wont to argue that more was intended and included by a given command or saying than the mere letter would imply. There is a fairly close Rabbinic parallel even to the very phrase of Matthew, 'Ye have heard—but I say,' which runs, 'You might understand a given passage or law to mean, or to mean only, so and so, therefore there is a teaching to say that,' &c. See Schechter: 'Rabbinic

Parallels to the New Testament,' *J. Q. R.* Vol. XII. p. 427 (April, 1900), and 'Rabbinic Conceptions of Holiness, *J. Q. R.* Vol. X. p. 11 (October, 1897). But Dr Schechter's interpretation, suitable for the first two examples, is unsuitable for the last two, and rather awkward though not impossible for the middle two examples. It may, however, be that the antithesis has been added by the Evangelist or an earlier redactor to the last two and perhaps even to the third (divorce). In the fourth example it might perhaps be said that the command not to swear falsely implies the higher rule: swear not at all.

Pfleiderer holds that the phrase could not have been used by Jesus. Teaching as Jesus did the binding force and the immutability of the Mosaic Law, he would scarcely have thus set himself up as the new lawgiver in opposition to the old. The phrase is rather an expression of the consciousness of the Church, which regarded Christianity as the new law, and saw in Christ the perfect lawgiver who completed and fulfilled the older code and covenant (*Urchristentum,* Vol. I. p. 566).

Shall we, then, upon the whole, conclude that Jesus, as the prophetic teacher of inwardness, wanted to show that the true fulfilment of the Law included and implied an inward and enlarged interpretation of the leading moral enactments? He did not mean to rail against the very Decalogue itself, by depreciating it in contrast with the new law which he was giving to his disciples. There seems all the more reason to think that this was the original form and intention of this section of his sermon, inasmuch as the greater part of his interpretations are so thoroughly Rabbinic in character and tone.

A further point to remember is that the Pentateuch occupied a sovereign position among the Jews, so that the conception of 'the Law' or 'of law' as opposed to some higher principle of religion was unknown to them. This conception only dates from Paul. 'Torah' to the Rabbinic Jew is not merely 'law,' but 'teaching.' He freely uses the word Torah where he bases his views and teachings upon Biblical passages outside the Pentateuch. The Pauline theory of the bondage of the Law is unhistorical. Certain enactments may have pressed heavily upon certain people, but the Pauline bogey of 'THE *Law*' did not press heavily, for it is a bogey, and bogeys are light and unreal.

Again, the Rabbis were quite aware of the difference between the letter and the spirit of the Law; only they used different terms to denote letter and spirit. To illustrate both these points, take the Rabbinic terms *shurot ha'din* and *lefanim meshurot ha'din.* The one means 'the strict letter of the Law,' the other 'beyond the letter, *i.e.* the spirit, of the Law.' Thus: 'R. Jochanan said, Jerusalem was only destroyed because they gave judgments according to the letter of the Law' (and not according to the spirit). And take this story: 'Some labourers broke the wine-barrels belonging to Rabba bar Chanan, and he took away their clothes. They came to Rab and told him what had happened. He said to Rabba, "Give them back their clothes." Rabba said to him, "Is this the Law?" Rab said, "Yes, it is, for we read in *Proverbs*, That thou mayest walk in the way of good men." Rabba then gave them back their clothes. But they said to him: "We are poor, and have toiled all day; we are hungry, and have nothing." Then Rab said to Rabba, "Go and give them their wages." Rabba said to Rab: "But is this the *Law*?" Rab said to him, "Yes, it is, for it says in *Proverbs*, And keep the paths of the righteous"' (Baba Mezia, 30 *b* and 83 *a*; Wuensche, *Der babylonische Talmud in seinen haggadischen Bestandtheilen*, II. 2, pp. 61, 85). I owe the passages to Güdemann, 'Das Judenthum in neutestamentlichem Zeitalter in christlicher Darstellung' in *Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, 1903, p 126.

21. The words, 'Whoever shall murder shall be liable to the tribunal' are not in the Old Testament. Jesus may have had a passage like Deut. xvi. 18 in his mind. 'The tribunal' is the local court, as contrasted with the 'supreme court,' the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem. It is rather odd that Jesus should not say: 'He who does a murder, shall be put to death,' instead of 'shall be liable to the court, or liable to the judgment.' That would be a more accurate quotation, and also more suitable for the sin. As Loisy says: 'il accommode le texte au commentaire qu'il en va donner' (*E. S.* I. p. 570). Or with W., 'The words "shall be liable to the court" are used to lead over to the contrast of the next verse, and to put it in relief.' Mr Allen renders 'judgment,' *i.e.* the verdict of the judges, and he compares the Septuagint of Deut. xvii. 8. 'Liable to the judgment' means guilty, and so condemned by the properly constituted authority. It is therefore equivalent to 'shall be put to death.'

22. For 'Sanhedrin' S.S. reads 'congregation' (synagogue); that is, according to Merx, the new society is not to admit, and is to exclude, everyone who calls a brother *raka*.

The law against murder is to include a prohibition of anger and of abusive words addressed to one's neighbour or fellow-man. (It is odd that Jesus did not see that he was guilty of his own offence when he called his opponents 'vipers' and 'children of hell.')

The meaning of *raka* is uncertain; Matthew was ignorant of it, and left it untranslated. It is probably the Aramaic *rayka* found in the Talmud, meaning 'empty headed,' 'scamp.' 'Fool,' in Hebrew or Aramaic, would mean 'impious one,' 'scoundrel.' Or 'fool,' μωρέ, may stand for the Hebrew word *shoteh*, which means 'fool,' 'madman' in our sense of the terms. Jesus hardly means that a disciple or member of the new brotherhood is literally to be brought up before a local court, if he is angry with his brother. What he means is that in *his* teaching, with its increased demands, anger is as great a sin as murder was under the Law. And to call your brother *raka* is even worse than murder, while to call him fool, deserves the special punishment of God. The intensifications and order must not be literally pressed. We must not take it as the deliberate opinion of Jesus that if a man, say in hot blood, calls his neighbour a fool, he is likely to be sent after his death into Gehenna, which for Jesus too often, alas, seems to have meant 'eternal fire.' If that were the literal meaning, it would be intolerably harsh.

The ordinary text reads, 'Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause,' but the Greek word for 'without a cause' is probably a later insertion. The original 'was an austere prohibition of all wrath, for within the Kingdom all men were brethren. It seemed a demand too great for human attainment, and so the Church took away its difficulty by limiting the doom to him who was angry with his brother *without* cause' (Carpenter, *First Three Gospels*, p. 24). But Merx is keen that 'without cause' is right and original, and his arguments are strong. Jesus would then, according to Merx, not have broken his own command in Mark iii. 5; his 'wrath' would not have to be explained away.

It is strange that M. Loisy should write: 'Les scribes étaient assez enclins à cette interprétation, que le meurtre seul constitue une faute aux yeux de Dieu, le sentiment d'où procède le meurtre, la colère par exemple, ne tombant pas sous le coup de la justice divine' (*E. S.* I. p. 570). It may safely be asserted, on the contrary, that the Rabbinic teaching about anger and putting one's neighbour to shame is precisely similar to that of Jesus. The Rabbinic Jew has nothing here to learn from the Sermon on the Mount. See Additional Note 35.

J. Weiss has peculiar views about 21 and 22. He thinks that only 21 and 22*a* (down to 'court' or 'judgment') go back to Jesus, while the details in the second part of 22 are later amplifications which, with their nice distinctions and calculations, reflect the anxious scrupulosity and legal outwardness of the Judæo-Christian community rather than the free and inward ethics of Jesus. Jesus uses 'judgment' quite generally. He probably thought of God's judgment rather than of any earthly tribunal. But the additions to 22 make it necessary to interpret 'judgment' to mean the local tribunal, so as to get the comparative and superlative degree of the Sanhedrin and the fire of hell. More doubtful is the tilt which Weiss makes against the legal casuistry of the second part of verse 22. Why, he asks, is the utterance of the abusive word *raka* worse than the inward wrath which is not uttered, while nevertheless this secret wrath is itself said to be as bad as murder? 'The point of view according to which the verbal expressions of wrath are worse than wrath itself stands in sharpest contradiction to what Jesus has just said.'

Though these arguments are decidedly ingenious, I do not think they are convincing. There may well have been some occasion on which Jesus said that to hurl abusive epithets at one's neighbour was a deadly sin. The distinction between '*raka*' and 'fool,' between 'Sanhedrin' and 'hell,' must not be taken too literally or pressed too hard. It is probably only Weiss's intense anti-legalism and his prejudice against Judaism and Pharisaism that enable him to find in the second half of verse 22 'etwas Rechnungsmässiges,' 'casuistic distinctions,' scrupulosity, externality, and legalism. The passage is broken upon wheels too hard for it.

And does not J. Weiss go too far when he greatly praises Jesus for regarding anger as an equal sin to murder? What Jesus means is that the prohibition of murder includes a prohibition of anger, just as the prohibition of adultery includes a prohibition of the adulterous desire. Anger is a sin, but except in a moment of paradox would even Jesus have considered it really and truly as great a sin as murder? Such paradoxical equivalences were quite usual among the Rabbis. But they must not be pressed too far, and even Weiss in another paragraph has more or less to acknowledge that he who can control his anger is better than he who gives free play to it. Another special reason for the second half of verse 22 would naturally be unknown to Weiss. No sin was more atrocious to the Rabbis than putting your neighbour to open shame, to make him blush in public. That is why to abuse him and call him 'fool' was so deadly a sin. It is quite likely that Jesus took the same line, as, indeed, the whole of this passage contains mere Rabbinic commonplace.

For it is false that the point of view of 21 and 22 is 'wholly new.' It is false that Jewish ethics knows of nothing but 'actions.' It is false that Jesus, in saying that God's law has to do with 'Gesinnung' (inward disposition, motive, character), was opposed to the whole spirit of Judaism. It is false that in Judaism religion was mere outward obedience; it is false that the relation of man to God was conceived of only as one of action and reward, and that character remains wholly out of account. It is false that the Law was an outward task-master, which evoked fear and not love. No one can understand the Rabbinic religion with these presuppositions. There is no such fundamental contrast between it and the religion of Jesus. The Law was not a mere external law, fulfilled from fear of punishment and for hope of reward. It was the Law of the all-wise and all-righteous God, given to Israel as a sign of supremest grace. It was a token of divine affection, and in its fulfilment was the highest human joy. See Additional Note 36.

Mr Allen has an interesting note upon the question of the authenticity of the second and third portions of 22. He says: 'Not only will the external act receive due punishment at human tribunals, but the inner feeling which prompts it is liable to the verdict of condemnation which will be pronounced by God. In other words, both prohibition and penalty must be interpreted spiritually as well as literally. The addition of the two last clauses is unexpected and difficult. Nothing further seems wanted. The Law said that murder should be punished by the proper authority. Christ says that the feeling of anger which prompts the crime will meet with the divine condemnation. In this way He fulfilled the Law by drawing out the moral principles which underlay the enactment. But the next two clauses seem to create an artificial distinction between the different grades of enmity and between the penalties to be assigned to them. The Sanhedrin, *i.e.* the Supreme Court in Jerusalem, seems to presuppose the interpretation of "the judgment" as equivalent to the local district court. Thus we have a climax: the local court, the Sanhedrin, the final Judgment of God. The corresponding sins are anger, contempt and abuse. But, of course, only the last two would, in fact, lead to trial either before a local court or the Sanhedrin. Nor is there any distinction between them to justify the increasing severity of punishment....The fact that, as the passage stands, κρίσει (judgment) of 21 and κρίσει (local court) of 22 must be taken in two different senses suggests that 22 *b* and 22 *c* do not originally belong here. They may be duplicate versions of a saying which originally stood in some context similar to this, where a distinction was being drawn by Christ between moral disorder and external action. Or they may be current Scribal precepts added here by the editor in a manner which has led to their being understood as part of Christ's words: "And (it was also said by the Scribes), Whosoever," &c. Verses 21 and 22 (without 22 *b*, *c*) would then mean: It was said in the Law that the murderer should be subjected to the judgment of death. I say that anger is equally deserving of judgment.' It is however, not necessary to assume that κρίσει is used in a different sense in 21 and 22. In both verses it may well mean the local court.

23–26. On Reconcilement

(*Cp.* Luke xii. 57–59)

23 'If then thou bring thy offering to the altar, and thou re-
24 member there that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave thy offering there before the altar, and go, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and bring thy offering.

25 'Become friends with thine opponent quickly, whilst thou art still on the way with him; lest thy opponent deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast
26 into prison. Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the last farthing.

23, 24. It seems pretty clear that these verses (whatever their source and provenance) break the connection. They would fit in better after vi. 15. Mr Allen, indeed, argues that they apply the principle of 22. Because anger is implied in the command, 'do no murder,' therefore remove all cause for anger before coming into God's presence with your gift. B. Weiss (*Quellen*, B, p. 6, A, pp. 91, 92) regards 23–26 as all taken from Q, though not in their proper place here. His arguments, which depend upon a peculiar interpretation of 25, 26, as found in Luke xii. 58, seem to me somewhat dubious. See the note in Luke. W. points out that the passage is rather suited for inhabitants of Jerusalem than for Galilæans. But note that 24 and 25, like 21, imply that the Jewish state and Temple are still in working order. The teaching is again perfectly Rabbinic and usual. Whether the verses are based upon Mark xi. 25, as W. thinks, is doubtful. A common source may be the origin of both. If authentic, they would show, as Loisy points out, that Jesus did not dream of freeing his disciples from observing the legal sacrifices. Perhaps rather it should be said that the Temple and the sacrifices are merely used as a conventional setting for the moral teaching. But Jesus does not usually use the Temple in this way: Loisy is inclined to ask whether the adage was not born in that Judæo-Christian 'milieu, où fut rédigée la parole qui canonise toutes les prescriptions légales.' Whether Jesus ever offered any sacrifices since the beginning of his ministry is uncertain. 'Il semble que non: il a prié et enseigné dans le temple,—mais on ne voit pas qu'il ait pris part à aucun acte sacrificiel' (*E. S.* I. p. 573).

In his interesting, novel, and suggestive little treatise, *Die Bergpredigt im Lichte der Strophentheorie*, the distinguished Semitic scholar, Dr D. H. Müller, argues that there is no reason to hold with W. that 23 and 24 could not have been spoken in Galilee to Galilæans. He points out that the teaching is even in form Rabbinic and usual. It carries the Rabbinic command as to robbery one step further. For according to the Rabbinic law a man must first restore what he had stolen before he could bring his sin-offering. And if he had brought the offering and it was discovered that the theft had not been restored, the sacrifice had to be destroyed as illegal, and the priest was not allowed to use it sacrificially. It had to be burned outside the temple (*loc. cit.* p. 13).

25, 26 (Luke xii. 57–59). These two verses are by no means very clear. If there is no allegorical sense to be assigned to the judge and the prison, &c., they merely urge the practical advantages of early reconcilement. M. Loisy says that, in the form in which we now have these verses, if there be no allegory, Jesus would here be giving counsels 'qui seraient mieux dans la bouche d'un paysan rusé que dans la sienne.' If there be an allegoric fuller meaning, the judge would be God, and the prison hell. The 'way' would be the life on earth, and the officer might be—though this is unnecessary—the angel of judgment. Such may be the meaning to Matthew. Loisy suggests that originally what may have been intended was an implicit comparison. 'Quand on a un mauvais procès, le mieux est de prendre arrangement avant la condamnation; de même, en ce qui regarde le salut, mieux vaut régler ses comptes avec Dieu par une sincère pénitence, que d'attendre le grand jugement qui serait aussi le châtiment éternel' (*E. S.* I. p. 574). It is not meant by 26 that the punishment of *hell* is only temporary. Mr Allen says that the connection between 23, 24 and 25, 26 is 'literary and artificial.' The verses are 'clearly a warning against the risk of appearing before God at the Judgment Day unreconciled to Him. He is alike prosecutor and judge and executor of judgment. Luke has the saying in a context to which this meaning is more applicable.'

27, 28. THE OLD LAW AND THE NEW TEACHING: (B) OF ADULTERY

(Not in Luke)

27 'Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt not commit
28 adultery: but I say unto you, That whoever looketh on a woman to desire her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

This is the second example of the deepening of the letter of the Law. The seventh Commandment follows upon the sixth. The woman must be, some say, the wife of another. For the adultery is committed against her husband. It is said that according to Jewish and antique conceptions fornication with an unmarried woman even by a married man is not adultery. But I doubt whether Jesus had these limitations in mind. I am more inclined to think (with Loisy) that Jesus would have said that if a married man coveted an unmarried woman, or an unmarried man coveted a married woman he was equally guilty of this inward adultery. Compare for the possibility of adultery as towards a man's own wife, Mark x. 11.

The doctrine that desire is sinful is quite Rabbinic, and can be paralleled in the Talmud. And W. acknowledges that even the Old Testament had advanced beyond the mere letter of the Law: 'Jesus geht, trotz Matthäus, über Job xxxi. nicht hinaus.'

Thus W. condemns by anticipation the statement of J. Weiss that it was Jesus who first turned what till then had been solely an outward 'Rechtsvorschrift' into a 'Sittengebot,' and that his inward point of view was something new, which has only made its way very slowly and with difficulty—'im Grunde erst im Protestantismus und in Kants Ethik.' No simple Rabbinic Jew who read the utterance of Jesus for the first time would find in it anything startling except the implication that there was any opposition between the old Law and the new. At the same time what Jesus says is not the whole truth.

> ''Tis one thing to be tempted, Escalus,
> Another thing to fall.'

29, 30. OF TEMPTATIONS AND STUMBLING-BLOCKS

(*Cp.* Matthew xviii. 8, 9; Mark ix. 43–47.)

29 'And if thy right eye cause thee to stumble, tear it out, and
throw it from thee: for it is better for thee that one of thy
members should perish, rather than that thy whole body should be
30 thrown into hell. And if thy right hand cause thee to stumble,
cut it off, and throw it from thee: for it is better for thee that
one of thy members should perish, rather than that thy whole
body should come into hell.

29, 30 are found in Mark ix. 43–47. The passage occurs again in xviii. 8, 9. B. Weiss contends that it was also in Q, but that Matthew has taken it out of its proper connection. *Cp.* the notes on Mark. Matthew reproduces it here from Q, while in xviii. 8 he mainly follows Mark. In spite of the use of the passage here neither eye nor hand must be taken literally (*Quellen*, A, p. 146, B, p. 61). This is doubtful. In the present connection, at any rate, the hand (like the foot) is less apposite, and verse 30 is wanting in some MSS. and versions. The hand does not lead to sensual thoughts, only the eye. M. Loisy says of the phraseology: 'Sous le relief paradoxal de cette image, Jésus fait entendre l'obligation d'éviter les occasions de pécher, dût-on pour cela mortifier grandement ses sens' (*E. S.* I. p. 577).

There seems in this passage to be a distinct ascetic tinge. Nor can it be alleged that the ascetic element is wholly wanting in the teaching of Jesus. There is a tendency to regard abstention as higher than temperate enjoyment, just as it is considered higher to have no money than to use money well. There is a tendency to put celibacy above marriage; there is a tendency to suggest that the highest religious life necessitates the abandonment of ordinary family ties. The result of this tendency has been seen, in its full fruitage, in the monastic institutions and life of the Roman Catholic Church. No student of history, no observer of facts, can deny the noble characters which this tendency has produced. But, at the same time, none can deny its dangers and its evils. Judaism has, on the whole, been opposed to it. The phrase 'to live in religion,' meaning to live outside the family, is the antithesis to Jewish conceptions of religion and morality. Thus this tendency of the teaching of Jesus is off the Jewish line. Judaism asks that lust should be tamed and sanctified. Lust is to become love. But the holy satisfaction of natural passion in married life is, according to the main stream of Jewish teaching, a higher thing than celibacy or self-mutilation. In the age of Jesus there was, however, an ascetic branch of Jewish doctrine. The Essenes were ascetics. Some have thought that Jesus was influenced by Essenism. Upon this question see Additional Note 34.

31, 32. THE OLD LAW AND THE NEW TEACHING:
(C) OF DIVORCE

(*Cp.* Luke xvi. 18)

31 'It hath been said, Whoever would divorce his wife, let him
32 give her a bill of divorce: but I say unto you, That whoever divorceth his wife, except for unchastity, causeth her to commit adultery: and whoever marrieth a woman that is divorced committeth adultery.

The passage must be compared with Mark x. 1–12. It is the first really *original* utterance in the series of contrasts, as compared with the best Rabbinic teaching.

It is also the first real or apparent conflict with the letter of the Mosaic Law. It is most remarkable, as W. points out, that in Luke the sentence about divorce follows immediately upon the sentence about the immutability of the Law. Luke, therefore, apparently was conscious of no contradiction between the one utterance and the other. The second statement may be supposed to explain the first. The abrogation of divorce is only a 'fulfilment' of the Law which permitted divorce; the permanence of the Law only meant its permanence in the higher 'fulfilment.'

Whether Jesus himself thought like this is more doubtful. The excuse which he gives in Mark x. 5 for the opposition between the Law and his teaching is more likely to be historical. Divorce was merely permissive; God, through Moses, did not *order* the Israelites to divorce their wives, as he ordered them not to eat rabbits. Knowing the hardness of their hearts, he merely *permitted* it. One can imagine that Jesus could honestly have thought that his war against divorce was in no wise a war upon the Pentateuchal Law. And though the teaching about anger and adultery 'fulfils' or 'completes' the Law in an easier and less subtle a sense than the teaching about divorce, still it is by no means impossible that Jesus did regard his prohibition as a 'fulfilment' of the concession made in old days to the weakness of human nature and the hardness of men's hearts.

'Causeth her to commit adultery,' *i.e.* by marrying another man. To marry a divorced woman is adultery, because this woman is still the wife of another man. The form of the saying in this verse, except 'save for unchastity,' may have been exactly as it stood in Q. Luke's version is influenced by Mark. Matthew's is independent of Mark. So Harnack, who also thinks that the *full* meaning of the saying is: 'He who divorces his wife (makes not only himself guilty of adultery [by marrying again], but also) causes his wife to commit adultery [by marrying again], and causes the man who marries her to commit adultery.'

Jesus saw that a weak spot in the social order of his time, as it has been a weak spot in all later Judaism till the present hour, was its lax law of divorce. He held that the sanctity of marriage was profaned by divorce, and perhaps he realized also that man was given a grossly unfair advantage over woman. The man can give his wife a bill of divorce according to the Mosaic Law; she cannot divorce him. This is the regular Oriental way of looking at women. They have an inferior social and judicial status, and unequal rights.

The words 'except for unchastity' (or 'fornication') are probably a later addition, with the object of mitigating the uncompromising universality of the denunciation. But it is by no means certain that they change the intended sense. For even if the words are an addition of Matthew's, and were not in Q, all the same, Harnack says, they are 'self-evident.' Adultery on the woman's part of itself dissolved the marriage. *Cp.* W.'s view given in the notes on Mark.

If not, what did Jesus think should be done if the man or the woman committed adultery? Was divorce forbidden even then? Are we to suppose that the case of adultery did not enter Jesus's mind? Adultery destroys the marriage bond *ipso facto*, and according to the old Jewish Law the adulteress was not divorced but killed, and the same penalty was inflicted upon the adulterer (Lev. xx. 10). But that adultery was punished by death in the age of Jesus is improbable. See note on Mark x. 5. It is perhaps simplest with M. Loisy to assume that, when every disciple of Jesus is even forbidden to allow an impure thought to arise in his mind, 'l'hypothèse d'un adultère commis par un aspirant à la vie éternelle n'est pas à discuter' (*E. S.* I. p. 579). But Christians were no more proof than Jews against human temptations and sins. The case of adultery speedily arose, and so, upon the one hypothesis, a redactor, by adding the words, 'except for fornication,' brought back the old Law, at least for men, as applicable even to Christians under special aggravated circumstances.

The extreme attitude, possibly taken up by Jesus, that under no circumstances is divorce permissible, may be untenable and objectionable; but the implied attack upon the cruel inferiority of women, and the unjust power of divorce given to men, was of the highest importance and value. Thus, upon the whole, we have not only to recognize the originality of Jesus, but to acknowledge that his words have been of service towards a higher conception of womanhood. Loisy says rightly: 'So far as one can judge, Jesus condemned divorce as contrary to the law of love, without however reflecting on the social reasons which one may put forward for or against the practice' (*E. S.* I. p. 235).

I am inclined to agree with the summing-up of Schmidt. Jesus 'had occasion to meditate profoundly upon the treatment accorded to women in his age and by his people, and he expressed in word and deed convictions on this subject that are as important to-day as they were then. When he criticised Moses for having given in the Law a concession to the men, on account of the hardness of their hearts, contrary to the will of God as expressed in the beginning in the creative act, he emphasized the equal right of man and woman in the marriage relation. In view of this unmistakable import of his saying, the errors that lie on the surface fade into insignificance. It is readily seen to-day that Moses had nothing to do with the Deuteronomic legislation, that the dismissal of wives was no innovation at the time when this code was written; that there never was a first man, that man in primitive conditions did not practise monogamy; that the Law was very far in advance of the rules regulating sexual intercourse in earlier forms of social life (though decidedly inferior to the *Law of Hammurabi*, which recognizes the right of a woman to divorce a husband she cannot love, and to marry 'the man of her heart'); that this law was intended to secure to woman, and in reality did afford her, protection, inasmuch as by the letter of dismissal the husband renounced all his rights over her, and could not legally interfere with her marriage to another man, and that the absolute indissolubility of marriage would result in greater misery to woman than that produced by the Law, by perpetuating immoral relations, annulling the existing rights, and making her slavery complete. The important fact is that his sympathy with woman led him to condemn the Mosaic legislation in this matter, and to contrast its discrimination in favour of the man with the equality implied in the narrative of man's creation. At bottom it is an appeal from human legislation to the divinely ordained nature of man and woman. Such is the relation between man and woman as a result of their creation, and consequent natural peculiarity of forming a unity by supplementing each other, that it cannot be right to allow a man to send away his wife in order to take another, and thus to leave a woman at the mercy of her husband's caprice. In so far as Jesus, by taking this position, declared his conviction that man should not be accorded rights withheld from woman in the married relation, he made himself one of the great champions of woman's cause' (*Prophet of Nazareth*, p. 369).

33-37. THE OLD LAW AND THE NEW TEACHING: (D) OF OATHS

(Not in Luke)

33 'Again, ye have heard that it hath been said to the men of old
time, Thou shalt not swear falsely, but shalt perform unto the
34 Lord thine oaths: but I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither
35 by the heaven, for it is God's throne: nor by the earth, for it is
his footstool: neither by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great
36 King. And swear not by thy head, for thou canst not make one
37 hair white or black. But let your speech be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay:
for whatever is more than these cometh from wickedness.

33. The reference is probably to a combination of Pentateuchal passages and not only to one. *Cp.* in addition to the ninth Commandment Exodus xx. 7; Lev. xix. 12; Numbers xxx, 2 and Deut. xxiii. 21—23.

34. Did Jesus himself ever swear? Some regard Matt. xxvi. 63, 64 as such an oath. So, for instance, Holtzmann, who would explain the inconsistency by saying that it only shows that 'die Bergpredigt das Gemeinschaftsleben der Reichgenossen regeln will, ohne sie deshalb in Gegensatz zu der bestehenden Gesellschaftsordnung zu bringen.' But more probably there is no oath in the trial before the high priest. Jesus is 'adjured' to swear, or to answer upon oath, but he replies by a simple affirmation or assertion. It is possible that the odd use of 'Amen,' ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, so often put in Jesus's mouth in Matthew and found also in Mark, was Jesus's favourite and original substitute for an oath ('Amen I say unto you,' usually rendered, 'Verily I say unto you'). Though he condemns oaths, he has to coin something in their place, a solemn affirmation instead of an appeal to God (*E. S.* I. pp. 565 n. 3, 581).

The most probable interpretation of 34 is, therefore, that all oaths of every kind and on every occasion are forbidden for the disciples and the members of the coming Kingdom. This would be in accordance with the practice and ethics of the Essenes. W., on the other hand, and others, suppose that Jesus's words have nothing to do with oaths rendered before a court of justice, but only with idle oaths in conversation and ordinary social intercourse. Others, like Mr Allen, point out that what was 'said' in the Pentateuch is that if you swear you must swear truly, and that if you are bound by an oath you must carry out your promise. The point is to fulfil your obligation. The swearing is incidental. But 'swear not at all' lays all the emphasis on the swearing and ignores the fulfilment of the oath or vow. Mr Allen thinks that Jesus had in view not the solemn use of oaths in religion (so that the quotation of such passages as Numbers xxx. 2; Lev. xix. 12 would not be in point) but 'the casuistical distinctions made by the Jews between different formulæ in swearing. In other words his teaching is opposed to Jewish tradition, instead of being, as we should here expect, interpretative of Scripture.'

35. The point apparently is that all these substitutes for the name of God are mere evasions. God is really brought in all the same. The throne of God and his footstool are taken from Isaiah lxvi. 1; 'the city of the great King' from Psalm xlviii. 2.

36. To swear by oneself or one's own head is ridiculous, for our lives are not really our own: they are given by God and remain in his hand. The last example is somewhat different in form and idea from the others. M. Loisy suggests that the last example (which does not so much bid us respect the majesty of God as point out the absurdity of a creature swearing by his own head 'qui n'a pas la propriété de lui même') may be the only illustration which Jesus himself gave of his maxim, while the others with their quotations from Scripture 'sentent le docteur.' (*E. S.* I. p. 583).

37. *ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ.* Is this masculine or neuter? Is it 'from sin' or 'from the evil one'? Mr Allen says it is 'the evil and sinful element in life regarded from the abstract point of view.' *Cp.* vi. 13.

In James v. 12 the saying is quoted under the form: 'Let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay,' which J. Weiss thinks is more original. It would mean, be so truthful that your Yes and No need no further assurance.

Merx points out that ὅλως (in 34) is wanting in S.S. 'Nicht der Eid überhaupt wird verboten, sondern der leichtfertige Gebrauch von Schwurformeln.'

There was a tendency among severer teachers to inculcate a certain fear and horror of all oaths; so among the Essenes.

As regards the Rabbis, it would appear (see Additional Note 37) that the Rabbinic *laws* about oaths must, in common fairness, be distinguished from the Rabbinic teaching about the *morality* of oaths. Apart from legal distinctions, discussions, and pronouncements, the Rabbinic teaching, in its higher and highest moments, does not greatly differ from that of Jesus.

In the Talmud, too, there are sayings about Yea and Nay, closely similar to Matt. v. 37. As to whether much idle swearing or frequent oaths and oath-taking was a favourite habit among the Jews, see Additional Note 37. J. Weiss makes the allegation.

38–42. THE OLD LAW AND THE NEW TEACHING:
(E) OF RETALIATION

(*Cp.* Luke vi. 29, 30)

38 'Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and
39 a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, Resist not the wicked;
but whoever smiteth thee on the right cheek, turn to him the
40 other also. And if any man want to go to law with thee, and to

41 take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whoever
42 forceth thee to go one mile, go with him two. Give to him that
asketh thee, and from him that wanteth to borrow from thee turn
not away.

We here come to the most striking, and not the least famous, of the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount. Müller (*loc. cit.* pp. 23, 24, 45, 46) points out that the antithesis about the *Lex talionis* follows on the antithesis about swearing, because the punishment of false witness (and the new teaching about oaths is an expansion of the eighth commandment) was an application of the *Talio* (*cp.* Deut. xix. 19–21). If it was not easy to speak of a 'fulfilment' of the Law as regards divorce and oaths, it is still more difficult to speak of fulfilment as regards 'tit for tat.' For Jesus here apparently tells his disciples deliberately that a certain principle or method of punishment laid down in the Law is wrong, and that the very opposite principle should be adopted instead of it. It is hard to see how 'resist not evil' can be regarded as the fulfilment of 'eye for eye.' All one could say is that Jesus fulfils the Law by correcting the Law. If the highest level or the essence of the Law, for example, is contained in the command, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' the principle 'eye for eye' conflicts with this 'essence,' and Jesus, by laying down the principle 'resist not evil,' corrects and completes the Law as a whole. But it is difficult to believe that this is what Jesus meant or that this was in his mind.

W. thinks that the antithetic formula itself is less in place here. For the *Talio* of verse 38 had long been obsolete.

38. The literal application of the so-called *Lex talionis*, or tit for tat, Exodus xxi. 24, &c., had been abolished by the Rabbis. If a man in a quarrel knocked out another's tooth, the tooth of the evildoer could not be knocked out as a punishment. All that happened was a monetary fine, quite in accordance with modern ideas. For the date of these Rabbinic enactments, see Additional Note 38.

Jesus, however, quotes the old law as an example of the doctrine of requital in its coarsest and sharpest form. As the old order was soon to cease, he sees no use and only harm in adopting the old methods for the cure of evil. Two courses only are advisable. Wickedness must either be cured by goodness, or it must be punished and annihilated by God. 'Resist not evil' and the 'right cheek' are, at bottom, the same teaching as Prov. xv. 1, 'A soft answer turneth away wrath,' expanded, systematized, glorified and idealized. Jesus was hardly thinking here of public justice, the order of civic communities, the organization of states, but only how the members of his religious brotherhood should act towards each other and towards those outside their ranks.

J. Weiss says that although the *Lex talionis* may have already been turned into a fine when Jesus lived, still the law kept alive the 'general consciousness that every bodily hurt demanded a precisely proportionate retribution; the instinct of a shabby, calculating, revengeful spirit (*eine schäbig rechnende Rachsucht*) was eternalized.' The sentences that follow are so serious in their assertions that I must quote them in full. 'Jesus knew his countrymen: he knew that this principle [*i.e.* of tit for tat] indeed determined their thought. He who knows Jewish curses must agree that there could be no more suitable description of them.' ('Jesus wird seine Volksgenossen gekannt haben; er wird gewusst haben, dass dieser Grundsatz in der Tat die Denkweise der Juden bestimmt. Wer jüdische Flüche und Strafanwünschungen kennt, wird zugeben, dass es kaum ein bezeichnenderes Wort gibt, als dieses. Die genaue rechnungsmässige Vergeltung ist ja sogar für das Verhältniss des Menschen zu Gott die Regel; wie viel mehr für den Verkehr der Menschen unter einander! Ein Urton jüdischer Empfindungsweise wird hier von Jesus getroffen.') It is desirable that such serious statements should be adequately criticized. The reader is requested to turn to Additional Note 38.

39. Luke vi. 29. The translation of the Revised Version is generally accepted, *i.e.* the meaning is not primarily, 'resist not evil,' but 'resist not him that is evil.'

It is clear that Jesus does not mean his injunctions to be taken literally. That would be to limit them. One must also remember that he is not thinking of the state, but only of the individual. He puts in as striking and picturesque a form as possible the doctrine that vengeance or requital is always evil. One can never cure injustice and wickedness by violence. The only chance is to cure it by long suffering and goodness. To hit a man back who hits you will morally benefit neither you nor him. The 'resist not evil' doctrine has been sometimes adversely criticized. But it is doubtful how far the adverse criticism is correct. There is, at all events, no doubt that there are hundreds of cases where the doctrine is justified and desirable, and where good people, of all religions, actually carry it out. Not to answer rudeness by rudeness, to suppress a retort, to forgive an injury—what are all these things and dozens like them but not resisting evil?

40. The second instance of not resisting 'evil,' or 'him that is evil,' is less satisfactory. It may indeed possibly be urged that the complete surrender of one's rights may be the means of making

one's opponent realize his injustice. It does, however, seem that both in 40 and 41 Jesus goes dangerously near to saying that all force is *necessarily* evil—at least if exerted for one's own advantage. He failed to see that such force—*e.g.* to prosecute a man who has robbed you, rather than to let him off—may be a benefit to society. He looked at the matter as if there was no such thing as an ordered society. He only thought of the two individuals.

And of the two individuals, he apparently thought most of the sufferer. The man is to do what costs him most moral effort. The natural impulse is to go to law and prevent the wrong; the natural impulse is to hit back; the natural impulse is to resist the *corvée*, if one can. Jesus wants us to adopt the harder course; the one which involves most moral effort. The disciple must have complete self-control; he must be utterly indifferent to personal wrong and injury. He must have utterly conquered the desire for retaliation, for revenge. He must turn his back upon the world and think only of the coming Kingdom of God. (To prosecute might for us to-day be often more in the spirit of Jesus than to let the offender off.) He wants us to be as perfect as we can. To forgive a theft, and even to make an additional present to the robber, makes the hardest moral demand upon us; it conflicts with the 'natural man' most. It is least like what a mere tit-for-tat sort of man would do. Therefore Jesus bids us do it. The effects upon the thief are perhaps not considered, unless, as I have argued before, Jesus means that the robber's heart may be touched; the effects upon society are ignored. Moreover, we must not forget that Jesus is giving counsels of perfection for those who are, or want, to enter the 'Kingdom.' He is not providing rules for ordinary society. He is telling what men must do in or amid the greatest crisis in the world's history, how they must behave in order to endure that crisis, and then to become members of a kingdom in which the need and the occasion for such conduct will no longer exist.

If the Rabbinic ethics is, on the whole, more sober and less enthusiastic than the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount, it has the advantages of its defects. The Rabbis considered consequences more than Jesus. They had more common sense, if less genius. They had regard to the effects of a gift upon the recipient as well as to its effects upon the giver. They would scarcely have said, without any reserve or qualification, 'Give to him that asketh thee.' They had a more 'Charity Organization' cast of mind and temper than Jesus. They did not forget society in their injunctions to the individual. And yet on fresh reflection I am not sure if this is not going too far. There is no ethical quality more characteristic of old Rabbinic Judaism than 'Rachmonuth'—pity.

The beggar whose point of view is that you ought to thank him for allowing him to give you the opportunity for showing 'Rachmonuth' is a characteristically Jewish figure.

It is quite likely that the world is the richer for both kinds of ethical teaching. The paradoxical enthusiasm of Jesus has helped the world, but it has also needed the cool, deliberate counsel of those 'who have looked before and after,' measured consequences and weighed the pro and con. We can never know how much hot anger has been quelled, how much lust for vengeance has been suppressed, how much self-sacrifice has been evoked, by the paradoxical, stimulating, and picturesque doctrine of the 'other cheek,' and of the 'coat and the cloak.'

41. The third instance of not resisting evil is taken from the *corvée.* The Greek verb *ἀγγαρεύω* is formed from the noun *ἄγγαρος*, a Persian word, meaning a mounted courier. These couriers were kept ready at regular stages throughout Persia to carry the royal despatches, &c. They had the power to impress horses and men for their requirements, who should bear burdens, act as guides, and so on. Hence the example says, 'If you are impressed to go one mile, rather go two than resist the [unjust] requisition.'

This is certainly the least valuable, from one point of view, of the instances, though it might be said to be the most significant from another.

For in the right cheek and the unjust lawsuit, it may, as I have said, be argued that the object of the action which is enjoined is to convert the sinner. In that case the teaching is similar to the famous statement by the good bishop in *Les Misérables* about the candlesticks. The runaway convict repays the bishop's hospitality by stealing his candlesticks; when seized and brought before the bishop, the latter, in the true spirit of Jesus, says, 'I gave them to him.' This 'noble lie' as Plato would call it, is the cause of the convict's moral restoration. He is literally touched to the *soul.*

But if the soldier orders you to carry his baggage one mile and you carry it two, you will not help toward the abolition of the *corvée* or morally benefit the soldier.

On the other hand, if Jesus really meant in the fullest literal sense that evil must not be resisted at all, then the instance given, just because of its moral uselessness, is highly significant.

This is the view of J. Weiss. He says that the object throughout is not to convert the sinner, but simply to show the martyr's temper. Jesus demands the utmost abnegation, the completest renunciation and self-denial from those who would enter the nearing Kingdom.

42. This fourth instance does not fit in well. The other three instances dealt with evil, and illustrate the general maxim given at the opening of 39. But the fourth instance does not. The paragraph is artificially made up. Even 40 has little to do with the *Lex talionis*; while 42 has nothing to do with 39. Perhaps, as M. Loisy says, 'le rapport des sentences évangéliques avec les paroles de la Loi n'est pas très rigoureux; les sentences ont pu, et même elles ont dû, exister d'abord indépendamment de la relation où on les met avec les préceptes mosaïques' (*E. S.* I. p. 586).

The moral of 42 can only be accepted with much reserve. It is inferior to Mark x. 21, because the object aimed at in that verse justifies the means taken. Here the point of the giving seems merely not to show 'resistance' by refusal.

M. Loisy's remarks on the whole paragraph are well worth hearing.

'The law of retaliation: "eye for eye, tooth for tooth," is a penal law, suitable in its application to a low state of culture. It did not consecrate the right of private revenge amongst the Jews, —for it was the judge, and not the injured party, who regulated its execution. Here it is regarded as a defective law; to "complete" it there is substituted for the principle of justice which claims its right, and the punishment of the person by whom that right has been violated, the principle of abnegation which bears everything, because it has no interest in happiness or in property in this world. No doubt charity is associated with this abnegation; but the acts directed by Jesus, to offer the left cheek when one has received a blow upon the right cheek, to let the man who takes one's cloak have one's coat also, are not simply acts of charity; personal disinterestedness appears in them rather than love of others: for charity rightly understood does not require that one should let oneself be beaten or robbed, nor that one should yield a kind of indulgence to the unjust acts of one's neighbour. This advice may suit a small select band in a world which is about to come to an end, or men devoted to an extraordinary mission which requires from them a renunciation of self as extraordinary as their destiny, but not a society which has to live and perpetuate its existence in order' (*E. S.* I. p. 586).

Like most paradoxical moral teaching, these striking verses of the Sermon on the Mount seem only partly true. They emphasize one aspect of the truth, they ignore another. Righteousness is not tit for tat. To requite may produce no good moral result, whether for the doer or the sufferer of the original wrong. But the bishop's method would not always succeed. One needs to *be that bishop* to try it with likelihood of good results. If 'to resist not evil' may be one aspect of righteousness, to resist evil is no less so. Take such a matter as the White Slave Traffic. Who would not say that only second and third to the righteous labour of prevention and redemption is the righteous labour of punishment? 'Heaven' is the source of love, but even Heaven wields a sword.

Paulsen points out in his *Ethics* (II. p. 128) that 'one of the most painful gaps in the ethics of the New Testament' is that it has no adequate place for the knightly virtue of actively redressing wrong. 'To work and suffer for others is familiar to New Testament ethics, but the duty of *fighting* against injustice and violence for the protection of the injured is almost ignored. What ought the Samaritan to have done if he had arrived on the scene a quarter of an hour earlier, and, finding the robbers at their work, had realized that he could only save their victim by killing them? I acknowledge that from the Gospel point of view I do not rightly know how to answer this question. Moses who slew the Egyptian gave an unequivocal reply.' Hoekstra (*Zedenleer*, III. p. 214) attempts to rebut this criticism of Paulsen, but not quite successfully.

43-48. THE OLD LAW AND THE NEW TEACHING: (F) 'LOVE YOUR ENEMIES'

(*Cp.* Luke vi. 27, 28, 32-36)

43 'Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy
44 neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your
45 enemies, and pray for them who persecute you; that ye may
become the children of your Father who is in heaven: for he
maketh his sun to rise on the wicked and on the good, and sendeth
46 rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them who love
you, what reward have ye? do not even the tax-collectors the
47 same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more
48 than others? do not even the tax-collectors the same? Ye, then,
shall be perfect, even as your Father who is in heaven is perfect.

It is nowhere ordered in the Pentateuch: 'Thou shalt hate thine enemy.' We need not suppose that Jesus was guilty of such a misquotation in order to score a point and to sharpen a 'contrast.' M. Loisy says: 'Les mots: "tu haïras ton ennemi," qui ne se retrouvent pas dans le Pentateuque, semblent avoir été ajoutés tout exprès au texte biblique, afin de l'adapter au commentaire qu'on veut donner par l'instruction concernant l'amour des ennemis' (*E. S.* I. p. 586). He regards it as highly probable that 'la citation, faite d'ailleurs par le rédacteur évangélique et non par Jésus, a été conçue en vue de l'antithèse poursuivie dans le discours' (*ib.* p. 588). We cannot think very highly of the morality of the 'redactor' or the Evangelist in inventing a sentence unknown to the Law in order to depreciate the Law. But unfortunately it is only one more example of the methods of religious partisanship and religious hatreds. The Evangelist was bid to love his enemies: we may well doubt whether he did so. Jesus himself, if he called the Pharisees 'vipers' and 'children of hell,' was equally false to his own teaching.

But it may be said that if 'thou shalt hate thine enemy' is not textually found in the Pentateuch or in the Hebrew Bible or in the Talmud, the equivalent of it *is* found, and that the spirit of it rules and reigns there.

Here one must distinguish. There is first of all the attitude of the Jew to the Jew to be considered, and then the attitude of the Jew to the non-Jew.

As regards private enemies, the best teaching of the Rabbis is not in spirit opposed to or unlike the teaching of Jesus. All one can justly say is that Jesus puts the teaching in a more inspired and enthusiastic way, and carries it to the extremest lengths. But it would be utterly false to say that *the Rabbis* taught a man to hate his enemy.

The very Law itself does not teach this. Think of Exodus xxiii. 4 and 5, of which a great deal is made in the Talmud. Think of the law, 'Thou shalt *not* hate thy neighbour in thy heart,' and again, 'Thou shalt not avenge nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people.' The teaching of Proverbs xx. 22, xxiv. 29, xxv. 21, 22, may not be perfect, but it enjoins the very reverse of tit for tat. And much of the Rabbinic teaching is on the same lines, and goes further. M. Loisy cites Numb. xxxv. 19, but this law (which was obsolete in the age of Jesus) does not really do more than make the Avenger of Murder the administrator of the justice of the State. In any case, in view of Lev. xix. 18, it seems a travesty of the facts to say with M. Loisy: 'Il n'était pas autrement défendu de haïr son ennemi personnel ou l'ennemi de sa famille' (*ib.* p. 588). It *was* forbidden by the Law to hate one's enemy. See more on this subject in Additional Note 38.

As regards the attitude of the Jew to the non-Jew, the facts are different. But it should be noted that, in this passage of the 'Sermon' Jesus was thinking and speaking of personal and private enemies, not of public and national ones. I very much doubt whether Holtzmann and others are within exegetical rights in quoting (with ill-concealed satisfaction) passages like Deut. xxiii. 7, xx. 13–18; Malachi i. 3; Psalm cxxxvii. 7–9. More accurate is Havet: 'De telles paroles calomnient la Loi, et cela est également faux quant à la lettre et quant à l'esprit' (*Le Christianisme et ses origines,* Vol. IV. p. 40).

It is, indeed, wonderful that Christian commentators who live in, and come from, houses of thinnest glass, should have the face to throw stones. For if Jesus taught men to love their enemies, how flagrantly have Christians disobeyed him! And how flagrantly they disobey him still! What is anti-Semitism but an awful exhibition of hatred? If Christianity possesses a higher teaching, what odd and serious flaw is there in it that it has so very rarely seemed capable of putting this teaching into practice?

'It is not too much to say that for the infinite wrongs committed on the Jews during the Middle Ages, and for the prejudices that are even yet rife in many quarters, the Church is mainly, if not wholly, responsible. It is true that occasionally she lifted up her voice in mild remonstrance when some massacre occurred more atrocious than usual; but these massacres were the direct outcome of the hatred and contempt which she so zealously inculcated, and she never took steps by punishment to prevent their repetition' (Lea, *History of the Inquisition in Spain,* Vol. I. p. 36).

True it is that the universalism of Paul was never attained by Rabbinic teaching. True it is that the Old Testament is, *on the whole,* particularistic, and identifies the enemies of the Jews with the enemies of God. Even the internal enemies of the community were thus identified, just as the various sects of Christianity have made similar identifications about each other. It is also true that the outburst of the great Psalm cxxxix. has, upon the whole, represented the *theoretic* attitude of the Jews to the enemies of their religion and their race. 'Do I not hate them that hate Thee? I hate them with perfect hatred.' It is just this sort of hatred that a man who called his antagonists 'vipers' and 'children of hell' must also have felt. But those who know the history of the Jews best, from the age of Jesus on, will admit that their practice has often risen superior to their theory.

44. *ἀγαπᾶν,* says W., does not mean quite the same as our word 'love.' It practically means 'show kindness to.'

The verse in its present form must be later than Jesus. The enemies are presumably the Jews who persecute the Christians. The sublimity of the verse is independent of its date. Its original form is, Merx thinks, best preserved by Irenæus. He has: 'Love your enemies and pray for them who hate you.' Jesus could have said this. This is ingenious and perhaps correct. One cannot help wishing that Jesus had practised what he taught. With the exception of the spurious verse in Luke, we have no account of any prayer offered up by Jesus for his enemies, or of any love shown by him to them.

45. 'Son of God,' in a moral sense; *i.e.* like unto Him. This idea is quite Rabbinic. The motive or justification of the conduct enjoined is very fine. A nobler ὅπως (in order that) was never penned. Not to gain reward are the disciples to act thus, but that, through such action, they may become like unto God. 'Be ye holy,' says the legislator in Lev. xix., not in order to gain reward, but 'because I the Lord your God am holy.' The Gospel and the Law have both reached the highest levels of idealism.

'God is good even towards the bad; therefore be thou good even towards thy enemies.' Such is the teaching. Nevertheless, God's goodness towards the bad is very temporary, according to the Gospel! Does He not send them, after their life on earth, to hell fire and gnashing of teeth? So in the Wisdom of Solomon and in the Talmud we hear a great deal of God's longsuffering and mercy to the wicked, but, according to modern ideas, what we hear is, like the Gospel teaching, inadequate.

The idea of the sun and the rain being of use to both bad and good is also found in the Talmud.

46. Another blow to tit for tat. Jesus is always at his best when he attacks that doctrine. He is then also most truly original. 'Reward' is from God. The present ἔχετε (have ye) is probably wrong. It should be future. The reward is to be given in the future life or in the new Kingdom.

47. A greeting in the East is a token of goodwill. 'Pour saisir toute la portée de ce dernier exemple, il faut se rappeler la signification et l'importance de la salutation chez les Orientaux: témoignage de respect et d'affection, accompagné de bénédictions et de souhaits' (Loisy, *E. S.* I. p. 589). The verse is wanting in S.S. and may be interpolated. It seems to interrupt the connection and to fall into a lower sphere. The supreme test and instance of the 'perfection' demanded is to love one's enemies. So Merx.

48. 'Perfect' (in Greek τέλειος) is only found in the Gospels here and Matt. xix. 21. Merx, following the S.S., thinks ὡς (as) is wrong. Man cannot be as perfect as God. It should be ὧν: *i.e.* 'be ye perfect, whose Father in heaven is perfect.'

Luke has οἰκτίρμονες, pitiful, which W. thinks is more genuine. Mr Allen thinks, on the contrary, that 'perfect' is the original adjective; *cp.* Deut. xviii. 13, Septuagint, 'Ye shall be perfect with the Lord your God.' So B. Weiss, rather cogently, argues, 'God's perfection it is which is shown by His conduct as given in 45' (*Quellen*, B, p. 9).

The injunction to imitate God by being and doing good is characteristically Jewish and Rabbinic. Yet some commentators cannot omit the pleasure of a hit at the Law. The corresponding injunction in Lev. xix. 2 ('Be ye holy, for I, the Lord your God, am holy') has only, they inaccurately say, to do with 'outward,' 'Levitical' purity. Even M. Loisy (*E. S.* I. p. 589) joins with the Protestant commentators in a sneer at the holiness required in Leviticus by the 'Dieu d'Israël' (as if this God were quite another God than the God of Jesus!). But the sneer recoils on those who make it. The holiness required in Leviticus is no less moral than outward. It includes:

(1) The reverence of parents.
(2) Charity to the poor.
(3) Truth of word and deed.
(4) Justice in all business transactions.
(5) Honour shown to the aged.
(6) Equal justice before the law to rich and poor.
(7) No tale-bearing or malice.
(8) The love of one's neighbour.
(9) The love of the stranger.

It does not seem to me that this moral code need fear comparison in holiness with any other teaching. Has the Christian world greatly advanced beyond it in practice as well as in theory?

With regard to the last verses of the fifth chapter, M. Loisy is again well worth quoting. He says:

'These counsels of renunciation and charity have the same absolute character as the preceding ones. If it were desired to apply them literally to individual conduct, to social organization, and the law of nations, it would be impossible to seek for the reparation of any injustice, and the robbers would be masters of the world; the progress of commerce and civilization would be impossible; Christian nations would be obliged to let themselves be exterminated by the other nations. With the best will to maintain the rigour of the evangelical precepts, tradition has been able to preserve only their spirit. Rules which were fitting when the Kingdom of God was viewed as something close at hand were bound to suffer numerous qualifications in their application, if they were to be adapted to the needs of a durable society and to the actual conditions of human development' (*E. S.* I. p. 593; *cp.* also the sensible remarks in the Introduction, I. pp. 234, 235).

The usual Jewish criticism of the injunction 'Love your enemies' is that it is paradoxical, impracticable and absurd. One never opens a Jewish book or pamphlet which deals with Jesus or the New Testament without this invariable criticism. Thus I open one of the last articles I have recently read, a criticism of Harnack's *Essence of Christianity* by Dr Eschelbacher. There we read:

'The Jewish law enjoined help and aid to be given to our enemies when in need. It says: "If thou meet thine enemy's ox or ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again." Its sages urged: "Say not, I will do to him as he hath done to me; I will render to the man according to his work." And again: "If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink." But Judaism has not ordered us to *love* our enemies. It has regarded such a command as unfulfillable. It has considered that the emotion of *love* towards those who curse, hate, revile, and seek to destroy us is impossible. The very demand for such a feeling is, perhaps, not even good. For even self-denial has its limits; to fight is sometimes not only a necessity, but also a duty. One can only legitimately ask that such a fight should be exclusively directed towards wicked, threatening, and powerful antagonists; there must be no attack upon the conquered, the weak, and the needy. These, on the contrary, must be rendered every helpful support and assistance Such good deeds may then lead on to friendly feelings and reconciliation. And the Christian command to "love the enemy" has not led to any higher, nobler deeds towards him than these' (*Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, Vol. XLVII. p. 144, 1903).

It is, in fact, contended by Jewish critics that the defect in the ethical teaching of Jesus is that it is strung so high that it has failed to produce solid and practical results just where its admirers vaunt that it differs from, and is superior to, the ethical codes of the Pentateuch, the Prophets and the Rabbis. The most startlingly *new* feature of the teaching of Jesus, as its advocates often contend, is: 'Love your enemies.' W. tells us that 'love' does not here mean, or even include, 'feel the emotion and passion of love for your enemies,' but that it merely means 'do good to them.' But this is hardly what it has been boasted to mean. If it only meant that, it would hardly be so very 'new.' The old codes said: 'Bear no grudge'; 'do not revenge'; 'if your enemy is in distress and you can help him, do so.' It cannot be denied that the Jewish codes go as far as this, both in the Bible and in the Talmud. The Jewish critics contend that human nature *can* go as far as this, and that if you so order and urge men, they will not wholly and markedly fail; whereas if you go further, and say, '*Love* your enemies,' you ask what cannot be given. Hence your command is neglected, and the result of this unpractical injunction is that things are worse than they were. The bow is so bent that it snaps altogether. The history of Christianity is, so the Jewish critics say, a proof that their criticism of Jesus's teaching is accurate. For how often, they tell us, do we hear Lessing's statement repeated, in one form or another, that Christianity has been tried for 1800 years, but that the religion of Christ remains to be tried? What does this mean but a confession that the teaching of Jesus, in its most novel and striking features, has remained virtually untried; that its injunctions are a dead letter? And the history of Europe confirms, so it is alleged, the complaint of Lessing. For the adherents of no religion have hated their enemies more than Christians. The atrocities which they have committed in the name of religion, both inside and outside their own pale, are unexampled in the world's history. And even to-day it cannot be truly said that the various sects of Christians love one another, while anti-Semitism is a proof that they do not love those who are not Christians. Toleration is, upon the whole a product of scepticism, by no means a direct issue of Christianity or of the teaching of Christ. Thus we see that the injunction, 'love your enemies,' is an injunction which has failed to produce a result. It was conspicuously violated by Jesus himself, who, if he had loved his enemies, would not have called them vipers, or enthusiastically predicted their arrival in hell; it has always been conspicuously violated by his disciples. And the very existence of it has caused men to forget and ignore and comfortably to violate the old useful commands which *were* practicable, and which could be obeyed: 'Bear no grudge; do not revenge; help your enemy when he needs your help and when you are in a position to help him.' Thus upon the side of public enemies and the enemies of religion, Christians, with their brand-new command, 'love your enemies,' have hated their enemies and persecuted and tortured them quite as much as could conceivably have happened under the 'dispensation' of Pentateuch, Prophets, and Rabbis, while upon the side of private enemies, where the new religion does not come into play, there is no reason whatever to believe that Jews have not acted up to as high an ethical standard as Christians; there is some reason to suspect that they have been superior. What, then, are we to say of a teaching which has so conspicuously failed in practical result? 'By your fruits ye shall be judged,' said Jesus, and by its fruits his new and superfine teaching stands condemned.

Does this criticism miss the point? It partially does so, if W.'s note on the true meaning of the verb ἀγαπᾶν in this passage be correct. Jesus hardly meant that we were to have the same emotional feelings of affection for the 'enemy' as for a bosom friend. He included all that is taught in the passages quoted by Dr Eschelbacher from Exodus and Proverbs. He idealizes; he is filled with enthusiasm. He generalizes, and he rivets attention by his brief, fine generalization. He means that active and helpful love must know no limits. Above all, it must have nothing to do with requital and tit for tat. It must look for no reward except from God. We are to wish no man evil, and (so far as it lies in our power) to do all men good. This is the meaning of the word 'love.' We must never avoid the chance of doing a good turn to the man who hates us and has done us an evil turn. We must rather even seek out the chance for good, and conquer hatred by love. Thus interpreted, his teaching, though it may soar higher, and strike a more passionate and fuller note, seems to be in accordance with those best sayings of the Rabbis which Jewish apologists are never weary of quoting again and again. The main difference is that the injunctions of Jesus (even as traditionally reported) are given in a form which, in every language and translation, arrests attention, and stimulates the heart and the mind in the highest possible degree.

J. Weiss urges that the demand of Jesus was intended to be an ideal of perfection, an ideal to which men can strain, but which they can never attain. Hence he strongly prefers Matthew's 'perfect' to Luke's 'pitiful,' contending that the 'love of the enemy' does not fall under the idea of compassion. A test of our capacity for such 'love' is to be found if we can honestly 'pray' for our enemies. I agree that a passionate ideal is urged, something more than not to show revengefulness in petty details of ordinary life, something more than to do a good turn to a man who has done us a casual injury. Jesus, in his enthusiasm and idealism, pushes the doctrine of love to the furthest possible extreme. It would need a similar religious fervour, a similar passion of idealism, to follow out his injunction in the greater crises. As we know, he did not follow it himself. He rather reviled the Scribes than prayed for them; he returned their antagonism with antagonism, and his denunciations show anything rather than love. Yet the ideal is not useless; though often impracticable, it is nevertheless inspiring. The Armenian can hardly be expected to pray for the Kurd who has massacred his children. Can the Russian Jew be expected to pray for the Christian who has just violated his wife and dashed his child's brains against the wall? There seem to be limits beyond which human nature cannot go.

Nevertheless there can be no doubt that an ideal like 'love your enemies,' must have often produced many practical results of value. Many an insult has been forgiven; many a possible 'tit for tat' has been forgone, because of this injunction. It must have had in numerous cases excellent effects. A moral ideal should always be above our complete accomplishment. Let it ask an ell, and man will produce an inch. Let it ask an inch, and man will not even produce the inch. That the ideal is impracticable is by no means a true criticism against it. Every ideal is and must be impracticable in its completeness. But we can struggle nearer and nearer towards it, and through its constraining power, a great deal can be accomplished. The impracticable ideals of the Gospel have probably produced a large amount of moral good.

What all religions have found peculiarly difficult is to love, or even to forgive, the enemies of their own peculiar teachings. Rabbinic Judaism could and did order its adherents to forgive private injuries and wrongs. One's own personal enemies one is not to hate, but the enemies of the whole people, still more the enemies of the faith, one may hate. The following passage from the Aboth of Rabbi Nathan is very instructive. 'Man must never say, he loves the teacher and hates the disciples, or that he loves the disciples and hates the ignorant. Thou must love all, but the heretics, the apostates and the informers—these thou mayest hate. As David said, "Do I not hate them, O Lord, that hate Thee? I hate them with perfect hatred." For as the Lord bade thee love thy neighbour as thyself, thou art only enjoined to love thy neighbour, when he walks in the way of thy people, but if he goes astray, then thou art not bound to love him.' There is no question that the injunction of the Gospel, 'Pray for them that persecute you,' is superior to the teaching of the Aboth of Rabbi Nathan. The only criticism that one can make upon it is that it would perhaps have been better if Jesus had added examples to his broad generality. I wish he had added: 'For instance, let us pray for and let us love the Pharisees and Rabbis who are opposing us.' But this he would have found it hard to say because at once religious passions would have come in. It was and always has been easier to call *religious* enemies hard names than to pray for and to love them.

The value of unattainable ideals is admitted and even emphasized by philosophers who are by no means ordinary Christian believers. Thus Prof. Taylor writes: 'The distant ideal is the source of our direct mental tortures, and yet without it existence would be unendurable....As moral beings we can never exist without some still unreached ideal to serve as a spur to our activity—can never, like Faust, rest on our oars and say to the present, "Be thou my eternity"; yet even when most irresistibly hurried forward in the chase of our distant ideal, we know quite well in our hearts that we shall only approach it to see it recede still further away from us....An end that is to be permanently felt as worth striving for must be infinite, and therefore infinitely remote, while any end that is infinite is *eo ipso* out of reach of attainment, and as far from us after a life of devotion to it as it was at first....The collective wisdom of mankind has long ago discovered that our ideals, whether of sensual gratification, or of knowledge, or of beauty, or of moral improvement are, one and all of them, unattainable. So that if indifference to the demand for a practicable ideal be [as has been urged by an assumed antagonist] the mark of a dreamer or a fanatic, contentment with a final and practicable ideal is no less undeniably the mark of an *esprit borné*' (*Problem of Conduct*, 1901, p. 401). Jewish teaching has to beware of becoming (in its opposition to and side-glances at Christianity) the teaching of an *esprit borné.* The teaching of Proverbs (apart from i.–ix.) and of Ecclesiasticus is not adequate for man. We need the correction of the Gospel. We need the ideal of perfection, the unattainable ideal. Especially when without the moral stimulus of persecution, Jews must greatly beware lest they tend to become tinctured with Philistinism and (in the bad sense) with bourgeois respectability. You may often hear from Jewish pulpits (with the usual side-glance and silent hit at Christianity) that the heroes of the Old Testament are useful exemplars to ordinary men and women, because they were not immaculate plaster saints, but had their temptations, their succumbings and their failures. The argument is of very doubtful worth, and one feels quite sure that if the so-called plaster saint happened to be included among the Old Testament worthies, he would be greedily and delightedly used for homiletic purposes by Jewish preachers. The ideal of the saint who is immensely above us in moral and religious worth possesses the same kind of attraction and stimulating force on the abstract ideal of moral or of religious perfection. Would those Jewish preachers not allow that the Imitation of God is an ideal that can stir and move the emotions, the reason and the will? If so, the hero of the Gospel narrative, even in the ideal form in which he is conceived by Christianity, can also stir and move the heart and the conduct of man. In fact we know that historically this has been the case, and that the imitation of Christ and of his believed perfection has been of immense and far-reaching effect in all classes of society and in every age. The Jews must be very careful not to lessen the content, the infiniteness and the paradox of the ideal. They will otherwise infallibly lessen the beauty, the greatness, the originality, the *abandon*, and the grandeur of the moral and religious characters, which only such ideals can produce and sustain.

CHAPTER VI

1–4. Of Almsgiving

(Not in Luke)

1 'Take heed that ye perform not your righteousness before men,
to be seen by them: otherwise ye have no reward from your
2 Father who is in heaven. So then, when thou givest alms, do not
sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues
and in the streets, that they may be glorified by men.
3 Verily I say unto you, They receive their reward. But when thou
givest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth:
4 that thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father, who looketh
upon what is secret, will reward thee.

The Sermon now proceeds to deal with three special acts of the religious life—almsgiving, prayer, and fasting—and it shows in what ways these must be practised to possess any religious value. It is disputed whether any portion of Chapter vi. formed part of the original Sermon. Loisy thinks that vii. 1 followed originally on v. 48; Chapter vi. is partly made up of passages from Q, and partly of additions from the Evangelist himself (7, 8, 14, 15). Weiss, on the contrary, supposes that 1–6 and 16–18 are integral portions of the original Sermon.

1. Some suppose that the Greek word δικαιοσύνη (righteousness) stands here for 'almsgiving.' It is a translation of the Hebrew *tzedakah*, which, literally meaning righteousness, was used in later Hebrew to signify almsgiving. But Merx is keen that δικαιοσύνη means here 'righteousness.' It has the same meaning here as in v. 20. It refers to the higher righteousness which is expected of the disciples of the Kingdom. This righteousness, like the lower Pharisaic 'righteousness,' is to be exemplified in true almsgiving, true prayer, and true fasting. The S.S. has the

true and older reading, namely, 'Do your righteousness not before men, to be seen of them.' Mr Allen also takes the same line and view at least as regards the meaning of δικαιοσύνη. W. thinks that δικαιοσύνη is made to include fasting and prayer as well as alms. 'Bisher hat Jesus zur Moral des Gesetzes Stellung genommen, jetzt geht er über zu den opera supererogata, zu der Ascese des Judentums.'

There is no novelty for Jewish readers in the excellent remarks about almsgiving. They are characteristically Rabbinic. Doubtless there were 'hypocrites' in the age of Jesus as in every subsequent age and among all creeds.

2. 'They receive their reward,' *i.e.* already. Their reward is the praise and reputation which they receive from men. Therefore they cannot expect that God will reward them also.

Jesus uses simple eudæmonistic motives quite naïvely and comfortably. He had not the least idea that there was anything immoral or irreligious in them as such, or that they were the odious mark of an odious legalism! The heavenly Father would of course reward his children with heavenly beatitude. The rain may benefit the sinner; but 'heaven' is for the good. Naturally the 'eudæmonism' of the passage gives J. Weiss a certain pang. It is specially disagreeable that in verse 6 prayer seems to be regarded as a 'verdienstliche Leistung.' Of course it has then to be proved that the appearance is merely appearance, and that Jesus has really and 'inwardly' quite overcome the horrible 'Lohnvorstellung.' What is *really* the case is that disinterestedness, purity, inwardness, &c., are all compatible with the doctrine of reward. No Theistic religion can say that goodness shall never be rewarded, whether in this world or in another. No Theistic religion can regard the permanent combination of virtue and misery as always and eternally right, desirable and true. Nevertheless, the 'legal,' quite as much as the Pauline, religion can teach people to be and to do good for the sake of goodness. The difficulty which J. Weiss finds, Jesus, who happily knew nothing of these prejudices, did not find. It is not found, moreover, by any simple religionist, whether Christian or Jew. He expects and hopes for a reward; but he does not love God, and he does not act righteously, for the sake of a reward.

4. 'Thy Father who looketh upon what is secret.' The Greek is usually translated 'who sees in secret,' and is supposed to refer to the invisibility and yet omnipresence of God. He is unseen, but sees. J. Weiss thinks the original text must have meant: 'Do your alms in secret, and God, who will see them (though secretly done), will secretly reward you.' W., however,

more probably, takes the words ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ as the object of βλέπων. An Aramaic and Hebrew idiom has been misunderstood. The meaning then is: 'Thy Father, who looks at (or regards) what is secret'; *i.e.* God can and does see your secret deeds, and He will reward you. So, too, in verse 6.

The text on which the A.V. was based added 'openly,' of which the right explanation is given by Dr Carpenter. 'Should not the world know that love and piety received their reward? In the interests of religion it was desirable that the blessing should be visible to all, and accordingly an amended version of the promise ran, "Thy Father, who sees in secret, shall recompense thee *openly*"' (*First Three Gospels*, p. 24). S.S. has 'openly,' and Merx upholds it: it may refer to the 'reward' at the 'Endgericht wo Alles offenbar wird.'

5, 6. Of Prayer

(Not in Luke)

5 'And when ye pray, ye shall not be as the hypocrites: for
they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners
of the streets, that they may be seen by men. Verily I say unto
6 you, They receive their reward. But thou, when thou prayest,
enter thy chamber, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy
Father who is in secret; and thy Father, who looketh upon what
is secret, will reward thee.

5. Jesus again preaches sincerity, inwardness, and humility. He seems to strike a new note in somewhat depreciating public prayer in comparison with private prayer. (For the wording of 6 *cp.* Isaiah xxvi. 20 in the Septuagint. Also 2 Kings iv. 33. W. would omit the τῷ before ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ, and render: 'Pray secretly to thy Father.') The Rabbis tended to do the reverse. 'To go into one's private chamber to pray seems to us to-day obvious, but in contrast to the publicity of Oriental religious life it marks a great step in the *Verinnerlichung* of piety' (J. Weiss). Jesus is doubtless right. He would probably have maintained that the higher, purer, more difficult, and more essential prayer is that prayed in private. The essence of *prayer*, contrasted, by way of abstraction, with *praise*, is a private and personal communion between the individual and God. 'La chambre et la porte fermée signifient le caractère tout intime de la vraie prière, secret qui doit rester entre l'âme qui la fait, et Dieu qui l'entend. On ne saurait exprimer plus énergiquement la

nature spirituelle et personnelle de la véritable piété' (*E. S.* I. p. 596). Doubtless there are also points of special value and importance in public and congregational prayer, and to these the Rabbis rightly draw attention. Man needs both. As to hypocrisy, that is derided by the Rabbis as well as by Jesus.

Dr Büchler (in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. x. No. 38, Jan. 1909, pp. 266-270) has given a fresh interpretation of Matt. vi. 1-6, 16 based upon Rabbinical literature. The usual view of verse 2 is that the word σαλπίσῃς (sound a trumpet) is used purely metaphorically, while the rest of the verse refers to public collections for the poor made on Sabbaths in the Synagogues. Dr Büchler believes that the allusion to trumpets and to praying and almsgiving in the streets (2 and 5) points to the particular and only occasion when such practices prevailed. This was on public fast-days for rain, held usually in seasons of drought during October and November. Perhaps Matt. vi. 1-6, 16 may have been spoken at this very season. Jesus would seem to deprecate the public giving of alms and the public fasting which then prevailed. At all events there is no other allusion to praying in the streets in the Rabbinical literature. Jesus would mean, Do not let the public trumpet herald your almsgiving and call it into prominence. 'The Mishnah tells us that on these days of public fasting on occasion of a drought, the scene of the service was the street or market-place (*Taanith* II. § 1 *seq.*); the leaders of the community gathered there round the Ark containing the Law; and after an address by one of the Rabbis, who reminded the assemblage of the example of Nineveh and called his hearers to genuine repentance, the prayers for rain commenced. Here, then, we have the only prayers recorded as being recited in the streets, and of the many present it may well be that some joined with no true humiliation in their hearts, but to be seen of men in the assembly, and some stood at the street corners praying with questionable sincerity. The people as a whole are not, it is true, represented as praying at these public fasts; they merely respond Amen. But we read how they broke into tears when Rabbi Eliezer addressed them and recited the prayer composed by himself (T. B. *Taanith* 25 b). But it is especially to be noticed that on such occasions the ram's horn (*shofar*) was blown after each of the six additional benedictions at the end of the prayers. The overseer (*hazan*) of the congregation gave the direction, "Blow, ye priests, blow (the horn)," and again, "Sound, ye sons of Aaron, sound." We have, at all events, the precise statement that this was the mode of procedure in Sepphoris in the age of Halafta and Hananja ben Teradjon. Now it was well understood that on such days, when God's mercy was besought, men must themselves exercise mercy practically in the form of almsgiving. Thus we read (T. B. *Synhedrin* 35 a): "R. Eliezer says, whoever postpones over night the distribution of the alms in connection with the fast is as though he shed blood." This implies that on fast-days alms were promised, but not always given on the spot. The same teacher deduces from Is. lviii. 5 *seq.* that almsgiving is the primary condition of the acceptance of the worshipper's prayer on fast-days (T. J. *Taanith* II. vi. 65 b, line 14 *seq.*). And a characteristic story is told (in Genesis Rabba xxxiii. 3; Leviticus Rabba xxxiv. 14), how that Rabbi Tanhuma once decreed a public fast during a calamitous drought. When the rain still failed to descend, though the fast was thrice repeated, the Rabbi rose and said, "My children, be full of mercy towards one another, then will God have mercy on you." The people thereupon distributed alms. This practice seems to me to underlie the reproach against the public distribution of alms in Matt. vi. 2.'

7–15. THE LORD'S PRAYER

(*Cp.* Luke xi. 1–4)

7 'And when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen
do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking.
8 Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what
9 ye need, before ye ask him. After this manner therefore pray ye:
10 'Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy
kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so also upon
11, 12 earth. Our daily bread give us to-day. And forgive us our
13 debts, as we too have forgiven our debtors. And lead us not into
temptation, but deliver us from the evil.

14 'For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father
15 will also forgive you: but if ye forgive not men, your Father will
also not forgive you your trespasses.

The Lord's Prayer did not we may presume form part of the original Sermon. And vi. 6 was originally followed by vi. 16. But Matthew uses this opportunity to introduce the Prayer which he found in his source (Q). The prologue (7, 8) and the epilogue (14, 15) seem both to be the work of the Evangelist. So Loisy. But there is no reason why these verses should not have been said, on one occasion or another, by Jesus. They seem more likely to be his than Matthew's.

7, 8 thus form the special introduction for the Lord's Prayer, which the Evangelist desired to insert in the Sermon. In Luke the prayer has a different place and a different introduction, which is probably older than that of Matthew. But it is not wholly certain that the prayer was put together by Jesus. Mark does not appear to know it. B. Weiss (*Quellen*, A, pp. 70–72, B, pp. 10, 31) holds that all 7–15 were in Q, although not in this particular place. They should follow after Luke xi. 1, which is also from Q. Luke, however, misunderstood the sentence he quotes and uses in xi. 1. He thought that what the disciple asked for was a formula, a short set prayer. And indeed this is what the disciple himself meant. He wanted a 'Gebetsformular,' but what Jesus gave them was a 'Mustergebet.' He taught them how they could pray shortly, and how they could comprise all that they need ask for within the limits of one brief and simple prayer. This distinction seems too subtle. It is doubtful too whether he is right in claiming that Matthew's version in its entirety is more original than Luke's. The arguments are rather fine-drawn. The last argument is that it is very unlikely that Matthew would have enlarged the prayer, just after a warning from Jesus against much speaking.

7. Before, the disciples had been warned not to imitate hypocritical Pharisees. Here they are warned not to imitate the heathen.

What *βατταλογεῖν* means does not seem quite certain. The explanation of it in the second half of the verse may not be correct. It may mean idle babbling, magical formulæ, weary repetitions, and such like. God cannot be compelled to hearken by force of lengthy supplications and verbal bombardments. He knows our needs before we open our mouths.

Some of the *best* Rabbinic sayings are in accordance with this teaching.

9. The form of the Lord's Prayer in Luke is shorter and doubtless more original. The *seven* petitions in Matthew are characteristic, for that holy number is a favourite with him. The prayer has many close Rabbinic analogies. See also Additional Note 39. Partly because the Lord's Prayer is not in Mark, W. regards it as later than Jesus. In Mark Jesus urges his disciples to pray, and even tells them before, or when, they do so to forgive those 'against whom they have anything' (xi. 22–25), but he gives them no formulary, for they are not yet a regularly constituted community. The prayer probably arose in the same period as the Christian worship generally, that is, after the death of Jesus, like fasting and baptism. Against this view Harnack energetically

protests. A short form of the prayer may well be authentic; was it not the regular custom for early Rabbinic teachers to have or compose his own favourite prayer? It is a common prayer, but not a prayer of a community. Why should not the disciples have been given a common prayer? But Harnack reduces the short prayer to even shorter proportions still. Originally it only consisted, according to him, of the three petitions, (*a*) 'give us to-day our bread for the morrow, (*b*) forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors, (*c*) lead us not into temptation.' Loisy thinks that the suppression of the first three clauses as 'redactional' is arbitrary and that especially the omission of the third request, 'Thy Kingdom come,' is 'peut-être tendancieuse' (*E. S.* I. p. 601, n. 1).

The brevity of the prayer and its conciseness are very striking. Jewish prayers tended to become too long; repetitions were indulged in to a wearisome extent, and too many epithets and adjectives of praise were added on to the invocation of God. These tendencies were, however, not so marked in Jesus's time as later. But the Lord's Prayer, with its simple, adequate invocation 'Our Father,' and its few short petitions, sets a fine example.

'Our Father who art in heaven.' A familiar Rabbinic and Jewish epithet for God. Luke has simply 'Father.'

'Hallowed be Thy name.' The opening of the Kaddish may aptly be compared. The meaning is: May God be universally acknowledged and revered on earth. His right worship is His sanctification. The name of God is an equivalent for God Himself.

J. Weiss, less probably, regards the sentence not as a wish, but as a confession, an acknowledgment. 'We praise and recognize thy holiness.' And by 'holiness' he thinks is generally meant—in the New Testament as well as in the Old Testament—not God's moral uniqueness, but his transcendence, his 'Erhabenheit' over the world and over men.

10. 'Thy Kingdom come.' The wish expressed here is eschatological and Messianic. As M. Loisy rightly says:

'If we wish to adhere to the historic meaning of the prayer, this formula must not be deprived of its eschatological significance. The reign of God is here, as elsewhere, the consummation of eternal righteousness and the inauguration of heavenly joys. It is evident that the text itself presents the reign as to come, and not as already in existence' (*E. S.* I. p. 603).

'Thy will be done, as in heaven, so also upon earth.' Not in Luke. The meaning is much the same as the former petition. In 'heaven' there is no evil or sin; there God's will is executed completely.

May such a consummation be also attained upon earth in the Messianic age! 'The words are an interpretation of the prayer for the coming of the kingdom' (Carpenter).

11. The prayer, having dealt with the future, now deals with the present, with the human needs of everyday life.

The physical side of life is not forgotten. God is asked to give us sufficient for our support—that the body may have enough, in order that the soul may do His will. Into the vexed and difficult question of the meaning of the Greek word ἐπιούσιον I need not enter. It does not greatly affect the sense. 'Give us our daily bread' must be pretty nearly all that was intended. Perhaps ἐπιούσιον is the equivalent of Hebrew phrases which would mean either 'our needful bread,' *i.e.* as much as we require, or 'our bread day by day.' Thus the whole would be, 'give us our needful bread to-day,' or, 'give us day by day our bread to-day,' *i.e.* give to us each day bread for that day. J. Weiss thinks that the most probable meaning is the bread for the morrow. 'Give us to-day our bread for to-morrow.' He argues that to ask God to supply us with our necessities for to-morrow is not in contradiction with the injunction not to be *anxious* for the morrow. Prayer is the antithesis to care. By asking God to provide for to-morrow's wants, by throwing the burden upon God, anxiety is dispelled. That the formula 'God will provide' can be productive of improvidence and carelessness lies outside Jesus's point of view.

12. 'Forgive us our debts'; but the word 'debt' probably means here 'sin.' 'As we forgive,' &c. The idea is quite Rabbinic. Only if we forgive others, have we a right to ask God to forgive us. (*Cp.* Mark xi. 25.)

Some Christian commentators do not like the simplest explanation of this verse, for it might be conceivably held to imply that Jesus thought himself capable of sin. But there is no reason to suppose that the historic Jesus thought himself sinless. (*Cp.* Mark x. 18.)

13. 'Lead us not into temptation.' A prayer familiar enough to Jewish readers.

'Deliver us from the evil.' Not in Luke. It has been lengthily discussed whether one should render 'from evil,' 'from the evil one,' or 'from the evil.' Rabbinic analogies would make it probable that 'from evil' is an adequate translation, and that 'evil' is not so much calamity as the inward evil, the *Yetzer haRa*' of the Rabbis, the evil inclination, which is sometimes also half-personified and regarded as a power of evil as much outside man as within him. So Mr Allen. 'It is better to assume a nominative τὸ πονηρόν (the evil), and to think of the evil as a wide generalization of the evil element in life.' *Cp.* the detailed discussion on the Lord's Prayer in Taylor's *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers* (2nd ed.), pp. 124–130, 176–192.

As to the beauty of the prayer there can be small question. It is not original in its ideas, but it is original in the choice of ideas, and in their grouping. Whoever put it together chose with fine religious feeling and insight.

14, 15 are an explanation of 12, and found in Matthew only. (*Cp.* Sirach xxviii. 2.) They are quite in accordance with Rabbinic teaching. Matthew probably himself added this reflection upon the prayer. 'L'idée appartient au Sauveur; mais Matthieu y attache une importance toute particulière, et, en l'introduisant ici, il pourvoit, autant qu'il est en lui, à l'unité du discours, la remarque qu'il fait se trouvant correspondre à ce qui a été dit plus haut (v. 22–26) sur la nécessité de la concorde entre frères. Cette glose est à sa place après la parabole du serviteur impitoyable, où Matthieu a dû la prendre' (xviii. 35; *cp.* Mark xi. 25) (*E. S.* I. p. 608). There is an interesting paper by Dr Charles called 'Man's forgiveness of his neighbour,' published in *Transactions of the third International Congress for the history of religions* (Oxford, 1908), Vol. I. pp. 305–314. Dr Charles is at pains to point out the 'startling contrasts which the teachings on forgiveness in the Old and New Testaments present.' Nevertheless, though a little grudgingly, except in the case of one favourite author, he allows that the doctrine of forgiveness developed in Judaism even apart from the teaching of Jesus. He is probably unaware—a man cannot know everything—of the wealth and excellence of Rabbinic teaching upon forgiveness. The dates are of no very great consequence. I am quite ready to allow to Jesus any 'originality' as to this subject which his disciples would like to claim for him. The important thing to maintain is that legalism could produce just as merciful and generous a disposition as anti-legal Christianity. The Rabbinic teachings are in this sense as 'original' as those of Jesus, seeing that there is no proof whatever that their authors had ever read a line of the Gospels.

Dr Charles quotes the most remarkable statement in pre-Christian Judaism on the subject of forgiveness. It is from the work which he has so splendidly edited, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.* The passage is from the Testament of Gad (vi. 3–7) and runs as follows. (The date is supposed by Dr Charles to be about 108 B.C.) 'Love ye one another from the heart; and if a man sin against thee, cast forth the poison of hate and speak peaceably to him, and in thy soul hold not guile; and if he confess and repent, forgive him. But if he deny it, do not get into a passion with him, lest catching the poison from thee he take to swearing, and so thou sin doubly. And though he deny it, and yet have a sense of shame when reproved, give over reproving him. For he who denieth may repent so as not again to wrong thee; yea, he may also honour and be at peace with thee. But if he be shameless and persist in his wrongdoing, even so forgive him from the heart, and leave to God the avenging.' Dr Charles thinks the parallels 'in thought and diction' between this passage and Luke xvii. 3, Matt. xviii. 15, 35 are too close for us to believe that Jesus was not acquainted with it. The Testaments were written, according to Dr Charles, in Galilee, and they prove that in that district there was a 'deep spiritual religious life.' But the 'religious development' which produced the Testaments 'appears to have flourished mainly in Galilee.' And then we have the following curious paragraph. 'It is further significant that it was not from Judæa, the stronghold of Pharisaic legalism, but from Galilee, the land of the religious mystic and ethical eschatologist, that Christ and eleven of his apostles derived their origin and their religious culture. *Christ's twelfth apostle was from Judæa.*' (Italics mine.) The innuendo of the last sentence is very remarkable. For a criticism of it see Additional Note 40.

16–18. OF FASTING

(Matthew only)

16 'Moreover when ye fast, look not gloomy like the hypocrites,
for they make their faces unsightly, that they may appear unto
men to be fasting. Verily I say unto you, They receive their
17 reward. But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash
18 thy face; that thou appear not unto men to be fasting, but unto
thy Father who is in secret: and thy Father, who looketh upon
what is secret, will reward thee.

16. The Sermon after the digression of 7–15 returns to the three 'works' of piety, and now deals with the third. We were told in Mark that Jesus and his disciples did not fast. Still it is conceivable that he may have laid down a higher rule on the subject for those who should wish to observe this rite. Dr Büchler supposes that the fasts alluded to are public fasts, ordained specially by the authorities on occasions of drought or of exceptional calamity. There is no reference to the Day of Atonement. *Cp.* further the note on Luke xviii. 12.

The rule about fasting corresponds with the rule about almsgiving. It urges inwardness. There must be no ostentation and display.

Fasting in the Rabbinic literature is rather public than private; we hear a good deal of congregational fasting on particular occasions and for particular objects. See Additional Note 12.

So far as I know, the rule about fasting is highly original. It is conceived on true prophetic lines. (*Cp.* Isaiah lviii.) The meaning of the injunctions in 17 is that no one is to know that the man is fasting. To all outward appearance he might be going to a banquet. Not to anoint the head and not to wash were the usual outward accompaniments of mourning and fasting.

ἀφανίζουσιν: *φανῶσιν*. The play upon words is untranslatable. 'They make their faces *unsightly*, that men may have *sight* of them.'

18. If one fasts, one fasts to God, and not to man. Therefore let God alone know about it.

'Thy Father [who is] in secret.' (*Cp.* verse 4.) W. supposes that the *τῷ* before the first *ἐν τῷ κρυφαίῳ* must be deleted, and he then translates thus: 'That thou appear not to men to fast, but in secret to thy Father; and thy Father, who looketh on what is secret, will reward thee.'

19–21. TREASURES ON EARTH AND IN HEAVEN

(*Cp.* Luke xii. 33, 34)

19 'Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth
20 and rust destroy, and where thieves break through and steal: but
lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor
rust doth destroy, and where thieves do not break through or
21 steal: for where your treasure is, there also will your heart be.

The passage is not closely connected with what precedes or follows. Luke's version is again, according to W., more original. To B. Weiss (*Quellen*, A, p. 239), on the contrary, who thinks that the passage should really follow vi. 33, 34, Matthew has the original wording, for 19*a* with its contrast in 20 and its application in 21 is the essential point of the whole. Luke has used a parallel version from his special source (L). Weiss is probably right here, and he is supported as to the originality of Matthew's version by Loisy. The whole of 19–34, according to Weiss, must be removed from the original Sermon. It has been brought in by Matthew from elsewhere.

19. The right use of terrestrial treasures is to use them as means for the acquisition of 'heavenly' treasures. The doctrine is Rabbinic. A close verbal parallel could be given. Jesus (though the German commentators do not like it) fully admits the principles of retribution so far as the life to come is concerned. 'Qui entasse travaille pour les vers, la rouille et les voleurs; qui disperse son bien en aumônes s'acquiert un trésor au ciel' (*E. S.* I. p. 610). A direct aim of our earthly life must be to obtain entrance into the 'life to come,' and by our actions here (almsgiving, &c.) we can secure that entrance. Only, the almsgiving must be of the right kind: it must depend upon the heart. If that is pure and set Godwards, all else follows. The doctrine of Jesus can be called indifferently 'justification by faith' or 'justification by works.' If one's faith is right, one's heart is right; if one's heart is right, one's works are right; and if one's works are right, that can only be because one's heart and faith are right. This seems simple doctrine and true.

22, 23. THE INTERNAL LIGHT

(*Cp.* Luke xi. 34–36)

22 'The lamp of the body is the eye: if thine eye be sound, thy
23 whole body will be light. But if thine eye be bad, thy whole
body will be dark. If, then, the light that is in thee be darkness,
how great the darkness!

Another detached remark, without close connection. The original place of the saying is perhaps better kept by Luke xi. 34 where it follows the verse which corresponds with Mt. v. 15. Using it here, Matthew, says B. Weiss, meant it to show 'dass nur ein gesundes (geistiges) Auge erkennen kann, wie das Herz eine richtige Richtung erst empfängt, wenn es sich ganz auf den himmlischen Schatz richtet, und sich nicht etwa zwischen Gott und den irdischen Schätzen teilen will' (*Quellen*, A, p. 77, n. 1, B, p. 39). This seems strained.

The eye is to the body what the heart is to the spiritual life. If the eye is clear and unobscured, the body, which in itself is dark, receives light; if the source of the light is obscured, the body is doubly dark. The metaphor is not very happy. So if the heart ('the light in thee') is not light but dark, how great is the darkness! For the only guide to light and truth in the spiritual world is the heart. Unless your heart is sound, no number of laws and rules and rites will help you. Mr Allen gives a totally different explanation. He supposes that the 'eye' in the second clause of 22 is already the spiritual eye. 'The idea is the naïve one that the eye is the organ through which light has access to the whole body, and that there is a spiritual eye through which spiritual light enters and illuminates the whole personality. This spiritual eye must be kept sound, or else light cannot enter, and the inner man dwells in darkness. But how can it be kept sound? The contrast *ἁπλοῦς—πονηρός* suggests the answer, by liberality and almsgiving. Treasure is not to be hoarded, but given away. In Jewish idiom a "good eye" is a metaphor for liberality, "an evil eye" for niggardliness. We should therefore rather expect here as a contrast to *πονηρός* (wicked), *ἀγαθός* (good), rather than *ἁπλοῦς* (sound). But (1) the phrase a sound eye may have had in the original saying a wider meaning than that of liberality, which is here imparted to it by the context. There is no such limitation in the passage as it stands in Luke. (2) *ἁπλοῦς* may have been chosen because it interprets *ἀγαθός* as = "liberal." According to this interpretation 23 means that if you are miserly and grudging, then spiritual light cannot penetrate unto you, and such light as you have becomes even darker, till it ceases to be light, and becomes darkness.'

24. God and Mammon

(*Cp.* Luke xvi. 13)

24 'No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will cleave to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

The verse seems to have been taken from its context, which is found in Luke xvi. 1-13. See B. Weiss, *Quellen*, A, pp. 249, 250, B, p. 56. Whole-hearted service is demanded for God. It is not to be a question of more or less, or of preference. The same slave cannot (truly) serve two masters, for if he does, one or other must be neglected. Even so, a man cannot be the slave of both God and riches, for, if so, the one must be neglected when he serves the other. A slave is to be at the entire disposal of his master.

W. points out that the opposition of hate and love is comparative; if a man has two wives, the one he prefers is 'loved,' the other is 'hated.' (*Cp.* Deut. xxi. 15.)

Jesus and the writers of the Synoptics are not afraid of using the metaphor of slave and master for the relation of man to God. They were unaware that it would be said by the commentators that the Jews served God as slaves, in fear and through lust of reward, while, for the first time, the disciples of Jesus served Him as sons, in love and without desire of reward. These oppositions are not only inaccurate; they are the creation of partisans.

That Jesus had a real antagonism to wealth and earthly goods is pretty certain. He regarded money as an evil in itself, a spiritual and moral danger for him who owned it. As Pfleiderer points out, he agreed with most ancient thinkers in supposing riches to be not a means for productive moral action, but a mere source of pleasure and enjoyment. With many other pious Jews of his age, he saw in the rich, as a social class, the oppressors of the poor, the children of 'this world,' the enemies of the divine Kingdom (*Urchristentum*, I. p. 650). What M. Loisy says seems entirely accurate: 'The incompatibility between the service of God and the pursuit of riches is absolute. It would be arbitrary to understand the text in the sense that a man ought not to serve God and Mammon at the same time, or that it is permissible to seek or keep riches, on condition of not being a slave to them. The possibility of such a condition is just what it is desired to exclude. In this sentence, as everywhere else, and especially in the discourse which follows, Jesus puts himself at the ideal point of view of evangelical perfection, as it ought to be found in those who are waiting for the coming of the Kingdom of heaven and preparing themselves for it. Such persons are not only spiritually separated from riches, they ought also to be actually separated from them. It is impossible for him whose thoughts are occupied with earthly wealth, to belong entirely to God' (*E. S.* I. p. 614).

J. Weiss rightly says that Jesus must have thought that he saw in riches a sort of demonic power, hostile to God, and the concentrated essence of the 'world' as opposed to the Kingdom. 'No reformer of the moral life of the world speaks here, but a prophet, who has finished with this world to prepare the way for a higher and different order.'

25–34. WORLDLY ANXIETIES AND OCCUPATIONS

(*Cp.* Luke xii. 22–31)

25 'Therefore I say unto you, Be not anxious for your life, what
ye shall eat; nor for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the
26 life more than food, and the body than clothing? Look at the
birds of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather
into barns; and your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not
27 worth much more than they? Which of you by anxious care can

28 add one cubit unto his height? And why are ye anxious about
clothing? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they
29 toil not, neither do they spin: and yet I say unto you that even
30 Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. But
if God so clothe the herbs of the field, which to-day are, and to-
morrow are thrown into the oven, shall he not much more clothe
31 you, O ye of little faith? Be not then anxious, saying, What shall
we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, With what shall we be
32 clothed? For after all these things do the gentiles seek: for your
33 heavenly Father knoweth that ye need all these things. But seek
ye first the kingdom, and his righteousness; and all these things
34 shall be added unto you. Be not then anxious for the morrow:
for the morrow will be anxious for itself. Sufficient for the day
is its evil.

25. B. Weiss considers that the right connection has been preserved by Luke who makes the passage follow the parable of the Foolish Rich Man (xii. 16–21). Luke has best preserved the original wording, including the 'ravens' (*Quellen*, A, p. 81, B, p. 49). The disciples and those who are preparing themselves for the coming Kingdom must not only not 'serve' riches, but they must not have any care or concern for the ordinary material needs of life. Thus 25–34 go far beyond 24. They even seem to say not merely that one is not to be *anxious* as to the earning of one's bread and clothing, but that one is not even to *attempt* to earn them. 'To say that we are not freed from the *obligation* to work, but that we must trust to God for the *result* is to weaken the thought of the text in order to adapt it to the actual conditions of life' (*E. S.* I. p. 617).

One has to remember that if Jesus said all these words, he said them believing that the great crisis of the world's history was at hand. He thought that the world was soon coming to an end. If one reads Luke xii. in its entirety, one sees this clearly. If the world was coming to an end, why labour to get worldly goods? God would provide for His elect till the great crisis came. We who do not live under this belief can observe and value, at most, the spirit of the counsel here given. As M. Loisy says:

'Jesus recommends to those who have devoted themselves to the service of the Gospel this absolute trust in Providence. But it is impossible to see in this counsel a rule which can be applied, without discrimination or qualification, to all men and all times' (*ib.* p. 619).

J. Weiss would wish us to distinguish between 'worrying' and 'providing.' Brave action is not 'worrying.'

Doubtless, over and above the coming crisis, Jesus had a dislike to acquisition. Man can live on little in the East. The disciples could doubtless easily obtain all they wanted from admirers and sympathisers.

Without this paragraph, and others like it, should we have had St Francis of Assisi? But we should, perhaps, on the other hand, have also been spared certain evils.

ψυχή. Loisy here translates 'life' as in the Authorised Version, and this seems correct. The argument is that our lives and even our bodies, which God has given us, are more valuable than food and clothing; if then God has freely given us what is more valuable, He will freely add what is less valuable.

26. The argument seems unsatisfactory. For (*a*) birds do labour for their sustenance and their nests; and (*b*) many of them are often not provided for, but die of want and hunger. J. Weiss admits this, I perceive. The idealism of the picture which Jesus draws is (says Weiss) but the reflection of his own sunny and trustful disposition, his absolute confidence in the universality and adequacy of his Father's care.

27. The commentators are divided as to the meaning. If *ἡλικία* means 'stature,' 'one cubit' seems a too large addition; if it means 'age,' to add a 'cubit,' instead of an hour or day, seems an odd expression. Nevertheless the second seems the better *meaning*. What is the use of all your anxiety? You cannot add an hour to your life by anxiety. All your cares cannot lengthen it when your allotted time has passed. Our 'times are in His hand.' He knows better than we. Let us not worry.

28–30. These famous and exquisite verses are also more convincing than the argument from the birds.

32. It seems plainly indicated here that 'God will provide' without human labour.

33. The word 'first' is wanting in Luke. But it may be original for all that. It does not mean that in the second place they *are* to search (*i.e.* labour) for food and clothing, but 'first' is here equivalent to 'only.'

'Righteousness' is added by Matthew to the 'Kingdom.' The whole Sermon is to him the rule of the new or higher righteousness. The usual reading is *ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ*. Both Holtzmann and

Loisy agree in making *αὐτοῦ* refer back to *βασιλείαν*. Thus *δικαιοσύνην* is taken absolutely. Seek first His Kingdom and righteousness. In this case we must surely assume that *καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην* has been inserted later. It is argued that 'His righteousness' in the sense of the righteousness approved by Him has no adequate parallel, except James i. 20. Nevertheless J. Weiss thinks we may reasonably connect *αὐτοῦ* with the noun which immediately precedes it, and that 'His righteousness' means the righteousness which is acceptable to Him, the righteousness which in God's eyes is righteousness; or, more briefly, it is being accounted righteous by God at the Judgment.

34. Not in Luke. The verse is clearly an addition, and not quite on the same lines as what precedes. It has several Rabbinic parallels. The verse relates not to the satisfaction of material wants, but to 'the difficulties of every kind which are met with in life, and about which one must not pre-occupy oneself till they actually occur' (Loisy). If a man does not worry himself about the possible evils of the morrow, he will, so it seems implied, be better able to grapple with and disperse the evils of to-day. The 'morrow will be anxious for itself' seems to mean that it is useless to be anxious for the *next* day. Each day has its own trouble. But if we limit ourselves to to-day's trouble, we shall be able to overcome it, and so with each day's trouble as it arises. The verse with its adage may not have occurred in Q at all. But it may none the less be authentic.

J. Weiss has a fine paragraph about this section on 'worry' (*μέριμνα*).

'Into our modern world with its hurry and its striving, with its desperate struggle for existence, this song about Care comes ringing like a strain from the lost paradise. Probably none of us can heartily accept the sentiment without secret objections, and many a man, who lives a life of need and struggle, will bitterly reject it as not meant for him. Here again it is made clear how impossible it is to apply without modification to later times, other circumstances and other men, a view of life which was formed under certain definite historical conditions, and was moreover an extremely individual view. To the Galilæan wanderer, whose slight needs were supplied by the hands of friends, and who in a rich and fertile country ever found God's table spread for him, life was easier than to the modern townsman who must put forth all his strength to gain a scanty reward. Jesus and his followers had broken the bridges behind them in the convinced consciousness of a near new world, where everything would be different and everything would be perfect; he was dominated by no care for wife and child, and for him there was no dark future to look forward to with anxiety. How different is the position of the man to-day! He cannot take the birds of heaven as his model. That is self-evident. But has Jesus's word therefore no message for us? Once again let us remind ourselves that 'to be anxious' (*sorgen*) is not the same as 'work and pray.' These two things are not affected by Jesus's words. 'Not to be anxious' means to have a free heart, to be courageous and active, to accept our life every day fresh from God's hand and to trust in Him. But such composure of mind is not only not a hindrance, but is even an inexhaustible source of strength for a successful struggle for existence. And how shall we attain such freedom from anxiety? Jesus says to us, 'Fill your soul with a great purpose, endeavour after the Kingdom of God, battle for the victory of good in the world, strive after personal perfection, and then what has hitherto oppressed you will appear to you petty and insignificant.'

What is remarkable about the sayings of the Gospels is that they are often applicable to wholly alien conditions, and true even without that belief in the end of the world which underlies so many of them—no surer mark of their genius and first-classness. The same may be said of much in the Prophets and the Psalms.

CHAPTER VII

1–5. CONCERNING HASTY JUDGMENTS AND CONDEMNATIONS OF OUR NEIGHBOUR

(*Cp.* Luke vi. 37–42)

1, 2 'Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment
ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it
3 shall be measured to you. And why lookest thou at the splinter
that is in thy brother's eye, but perceivest not the beam that is
4 in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me
pull out the splinter out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in
5 thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, first pull the beam out of thine
own eye; and then wilt thou see clearly to pull the splinter out of
thy brother's eye.

The passage is very loosely connected with what precedes. It has nothing to do with public justice, but only with judging and condemning in private life. Here, too, as in forgiveness, our forbearance or harshness towards others on earth is to determine, or to go towards determining, the judgment passed upon ourselves by God. B. Weiss supposes that in the original Sermon in Q, vii. 1–5 followed on vi. 1–6, 16–18, 'da das hochmütige Richten und Bessernwollen Anderer (vii. 1–5, 12) nur die Kehrseite der prahlerischen Frömmigkeitsübung ist, gegen die sich vi. 1–6, 16–18 richtete' (*Quellen*, B, p. 10).

1, 2. To 'judge' is here practically to condemn. If we acquit others, God may acquit us. Jesus does not condemn *all* kinds of tit for tat, and here is a case in which he says that God Himself will act upon that principle.

3. Worst of all is it to condemn a man for the fault which we also possess. Too many of us refuse to recognize our own faults, or to believe that we possess them. The ideas are much the same as those also found in Rabbinic literature.

6. Pearls before Swine

(Not in Luke)

6 'Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you.

This verse is quite isolated. It was taken from Q, as B. Weiss thinks, in some unknown connection. Though some commentators try to avoid the unpleasant conclusion, there seems little doubt that the dogs and the pigs are opprobrious Jewish appellations for the heathen, and that what is forbidden (even though the Evangelist did not so interpret the saying) is any preaching of the Gospel to the heathen or the Samaritans. *Cp.* x. 5, where much the same order is given.

It may be questioned whether this verse was really said by Jesus. Dr Martineau warmly denies it, but then he proceeds upon the doubtful principle that only such sayings and teachings to which no ethical or religious objection can be taken, or which win from us the highest ethical and religious approval, can have proceeded from the mouth of Jesus. Of this verse, for instance, he says: 'That such an ebullition of scorn and insult should proceed from him who extolled in the alien "a faith which he had not found, no, not in Israel," and who selected a Samaritan as the ideal expounder of the second great commandment, is wholly incredible. The language has its parallel, and doubtless the indication of its date, in the warnings to the Churches of Asia (particularly that of Thyatira) contained in the prologue to the Apocalypse (Rev. ii. 18 *seq.*), guarding them against forms of antinomian corruption which had come upon the Church of the second century from the growth of Gnostic philosophy and the misuse of Pauline theology. The verse, wholly unconnected with its context, is doubtless one of the latest interpolations of the most mixed of all the Gospels, and expresses the feeling of passionate disgust which the encroachment of heathen licence upon the purity of the Church awakened in its true pastors and people' (*The Seat of Authority in Religion*, 5th edition, p. 658).

On the other hand, J. Weiss is keen that the dogs and the pigs do not refer to any particular people. The verse merely says that it is no good to give precious gifts (*i.e.* to impart precious spiritual teachings) to those who cannot appreciate them. There are some people who are bound to misunderstand you. It is idle and useless to speak with them, or to attempt to convert them. Leave them alone. Weiss thinks that the reserve which Jesus practised (*e.g.* as to his Messiahship) on certain occasions to certain people is an illustration of the saying, which may therefore well be authentic. M. Loisy points out the difficulties in arriving at the meaning intended by the verse. He finally comes to the following conclusion.

'The Didache says that Jesus, in forbidding his disciples to give the holy thing to the dogs, meant to interdict the Eucharist to those who were not baptized. This idea, which cannot be found in the teaching of the Saviour, is nevertheless that which, if it be a little extended, is best suited to the text. It is implied that the disciples are the possessors of a holy thing, the distribution of which they regulate, and which must not be given to everybody; they have pearls which must not be brought out at the wrong time before coarse and brutal men. Just as little as this state of things agrees with the Gospel teaching given by Jesus, just as closely does it correspond to the way in which the Christian community regarded the Eucharistic assemblies. Is it not probable that it was in these communities that the saying was framed, "the holy thing is not for the dogs," perhaps in imitation of the words addressed by the Saviour to the Canaanitish woman, and that the Evangelist has merely picked up a sentence which was already attributed to Christ? In any case, he has in view some kind of Christian mystery, which is not the simple doctrine of the Gospel, and it is this mystery of Christian worship the knowledge and still more the reality of which he forbids to be given to the heathen. He presents as a rule of conduct that which the Didache makes a principle of the law of worship' (*E. S.* I. p. 626).

7–11. OF PRAYER
(*Cp.* Luke xi. 9–13)

7 'Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock,
8 and it shall be opened unto you: for every one that asketh,
receiveth; and he that seeketh, findeth; and to him that knocketh,
9 it shall be opened. Or what man is there among you who, if his
10 son ask him for bread, will give him a stone? Or if he ask him
11 for a fish, will give him a serpent? If then ye, being evil, know
how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall
your Father who is in heaven give good things to them that ask
him?

Further loosely added exhortations, this time touching once more upon the subject of prayer. The original place and connection may be preserved in Luke (so B. Weiss, *Quellen*, A, pp. 72, 73).

Doubtless Jesus assigned to prayer a higher power than we can assign it to-day. M. Loisy promptly brushes aside the quibble that while Jesus says that every honest prayer ('ask, seek, knock,' are all metaphors for prayer) will be *heard*, he does not imply that God will grant the realization of every particular request. In the full magnificence and simplicity of his faith, Jesus declares that every prayer will be answered. The case of a man asking for follies or absurdities or evil is not considered or thought of. Jesus, therefore, makes no restrictions; he does not wish one to add: 'It is understood, of course, that you ask for what is good for you.' Such a proviso would upset his whole theory, for whatever prayer is unanswered and unfulfilled can be regarded as a prayer the fulfilment of which would not have been 'good' for the man who prayed. 'La foi ne connaît pas les scrupules de la théologie' (*E. S.* I. p. 631). Or, rather, the faith of Jesus knew them not. One can, let us hope, have faith, and yet not have this wholesale belief in the efficacy of unrestricted prayer.

The passage, says J. Weiss, is another illustration of the optimism of Jesus. He judges the world by himself and from his own experiences. He must have known good people, and have had happy experiences of the goodness of his heavenly Father and also of his earthly father. For actual experiences of human asking and giving are the basis of the picture which supplies the key for the interpretation of the general order of the world.

11. But even good men are wicked as compared with God.

12. The Golden Rule

(*Cp.* Luke vi. 31)

2 'All then that ye would that men should do to you, so do ye also do unto them: for this is the Law and the Prophets.

12. This maxim is found in Luke in a good connection. Here in Matthew it has been transposed. 'This is the Law and the Prophets' may be an addition of the Evangelist. So Harnack. But B. Weiss thinks it looks back on v. 17 and is original. The verse is, he supposes, the true end of the Sermon (apart from the epilogue 15–18, 21, 24–27). 'It concludes admirably the polemic against the Pharisees, who always demanded honour and recogni-

tion for themselves, while they were always judging and condemning others' (*Quellen*, B, p. 11). The Golden Rule sums up all the demands and injunctions of the Sermon. It is that fulfilment of the Law and the Prophets which Jesus came to point out.

The close Rabbinic parallel, which in this case goes back to Hillel, and is therefore earlier than Jesus, is put in a negative form. The commentators declare that the positive form is far higher and nobler. It may be so, but I have a feeling that Hillel and Jesus meant pretty much the same thing. How far this feeling, or the opposite one that the negative precept 'falls immeasurably short of the positive command' (Plummer) of Christ, rests on prejudice it is hard to say. What I mean is that if an undoubtedly authentic saying of Hillel were to be discovered in the positive form, every Jewish writer would, I fancy, be rather pleased, while every Christian writer would, I fancy, be rather sorry. The *ideal* commentator on the Gospels should not care a pin one way or the other.

13, 14. The Narrow Gate

(*Cp.* Luke xiii. 23, 24)

13 'Enter through the strait gate: for wide and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there are who enter in
14 thereby. For narrow is the gate, and strait the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there are that find it.

The Sermon, as Matthew arranged it, closes with some reflections on the difficulties and tests of goodness and salvation.

The horrible doctrine that many go to 'destruction' and few to 'life eternal' was not invented by Jesus, but it was accepted by him. One wonders how any man could hold it and yet believe in a loving God; but the human mind is capable of the oddest inconsistencies. Harnack is anxious to keep this paragraph for Jesus with the rest of the Q passages that are common to Luke and Matthew. If I were as concerned as he is to claim for Jesus a unique position in the sphere of religions, I should like to rid him of the responsibility of such painful utterances as these.

Two metaphors seem combined. The first is that of the popular 'Two Ways,' which was common at that date in Jewish preaching. (*Cp.* for the phrase Jeremiah xxi. 8.) See Additional Note 41. The second metaphor of the narrow gate or road is independent. B. Weiss supposes that the true opening of the epilogue to the Sermon is now found in Luke vi. 39, which in Matthew occurs xv.

14. Matt. vii. 13, 14 is an insertion, the right place of which is in Luke xiii. 24. (This seems very dubious.) In Luke we only hear of the door, not of the gate. And the door is repentance. One good MS. and some versions omit the 'gate' both in 13 and 14. The sense remains the same. Two thoughts seem combined. The first is that the way of life, the way which leads to 'life eternal,' is hard, but that man can and ought to try to find it and walk along it. The choice of ways is free and his own. This was the older Jewish view. Through repentance and righteousness man can enter into life eternal. (*Cp*. Deut. xxx. 19.) The second thought is that the way of life is narrow, because few *are* to find it, because many are predestined to 'eternal death,' a few only to eternal life. This later, gloomier, pessimistic, and irreligious view is prominent in the apocalyptic Fourth Book of Ezra. The Evangelist, more or less consciously, seems in this passage to allude to the second view as well as (more prominently) to the first. The demands of Jesus are hard to fulfil. The metaphor of the narrow gate is assumed to be familiar and it probably was. But I can hardly think W. can be right in supposing that its origin is the needle's eye of Mark x. 25. See his *Einleitung*, p. 18.

15–20. THE FALSE PROPHETS, AND HOW TO KNOW THEM

(*Cp*. Luke vi. 43–45)

15 'Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing,
16 but inwardly they are ravenous wolves. Ye will know them by
their fruits. Do men gather grapes from thorns, or figs from
17 thistles? So every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a
18 rotten tree bringeth forth bad fruit. A good tree cannot bring
forth evil fruit, neither can a rotten tree bring forth good fruit.
19 Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is cut down, and cast
20 into the fire. So then by their fruits ye will know them.

The warning against the false prophets is wanting in Luke, with whom the metaphor about the good and bad trees has a more general signification.

B. Weiss, who wants to keep 15–18 for Q, where the verses followed, as he thinks, on Luke vi. 39, interprets the false prophets to mean the Pharisees and Rabbis, but this seems very unlikely. More probably the false prophets are heretical, immoral, or unrecognized Christian teachers, and in this form the sentence is later than Jesus. Perhaps they are antinomians, 'ultra-Paulines.' 'Those who are warned against the false prophets seem to form a group separated from Judaism, in relation to whom the false prophets bear themselves as wolves. That group is not the disciples of Jesus in his lifetime, but the Christian community already formed, and threatened by troubles and divisions wrought by individuals who falsely boast of the gift of the Spirit. The prophets of whom Matthew speaks here are evidently the persons he will refer to further on, as having prophesied, expelled demons, worked miracles in the name of Jesus,—people that is, of whom Jesus never had occasion to talk to his disciples, but who did disquiet the early Church. The passage belongs therefore to the redaction (*la rédaction évangélique*)' (*E. S.* I. p. 637). It is noteworthy that it is not denied that these men may have expelled demons and wrought miracles. But they have not fulfilled the *ethical* commands of Jesus. Just in the same way as Jesus here repudiates the miraculous as a test of discipleship, so would the Rabbis have repudiated it as an authorization to violate the Law. No amount of demon-curing could have made them accept Jesus as a divinely commissioned teacher, if his teaching ran counter to a Law which, according to the first dogma of their faith, was, like the God who gave it, perfect, immutable and divine. The metaphor about the good fruits and the good tree is old. *Cp.* Psalm i. 3; Jer. xvii. 8.

19. This verse is taken from iii. 10. It means here that the false prophets are to be cast into hell. What was originally a comparison or parable is here by Matthew turned into an allegory. In Luke there is no parallel to this verse.

21–23. THE GOOD LIFE THE ONLY TRUE MARK OF THE TRUE DISCIPLE

(*Cp.* Luke vi. 46, xiii. 26, 27)

21 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into
the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father
22 who is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord,
have we not prophesied through thy name? and through thy name
have we not cast out demons? and through thy name have we not
23 done many miracles? And then I will declare unto them, I never
knew you: depart from me, ye workers of lawlessness.

The excellent doctrine here preached was, alas, not maintained by the Church, for whom correct doctrine became far more important than good works. The passage is probably later than

Jesus, but characteristically Jewish and Rabbinic. The superb passage xxv. 34 *seq.* is its proper complement. Originally *κύριε* (Lord) may not have meant more than 'master' (*marana*), but in this connection it has a more theological signification.

21. For the second part of the verse, *cp.* Mark iii. 35. As the first part of the verse occurs also in Luke, the fact emerges that Jesus is already called 'Lord' in the common source, which here is probably Q. In Mark he is only so called by the heathen woman, vii. 28. Hence W. would make an inference for the relative date of Q. Moreover, while Jesus lived, there were no people who had an interest in giving themselves out as his disciples. It may be contended that *κύριος*, 'Lord,' as applied to Jesus during his ministry, had the same meaning as 'Master' and that it is in this sense that it is used by Q. Matthew will have given to it a larger meaning. *Cp. E. S.* I. p. 640, n. 1. Thus 21 may be old and genuine; while the next two verses may reflect a later age.

22. B. Weiss thinks that 22, 23 are an application of 21 to the antinomians of the Evangelist's day, based upon verses of Q now found in Luke xiii. 26, 27 (*Quellen*, A, p. 97, B, p. 13). So too Loisy. 'In that day' is on the Day of Judgment. Here Jesus speaks openly as the Messiah and the Judge.

23. *ἀνομία.* The term 'lawlessness' is characteristic of the strain or strand in Matthew which we have already noted in v. 18, 19. But it is taken over from the Greek version of Psalm vi. 8 (Heb. 9), from which the words 'Depart from me, ye workers of lawlessness,' are quoted. Luke has *ἀδικία*, wickedness. The complicated question of the relation between Luke and Matthew is well illustrated by these verses. Matt. vii. 21 corresponds with Luke vi. 46. Scholars are agreed that here Matthew preserves an older form of the same source, whether this be Q or no. See *e.g.* Harnack, *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, p. 52. Matt. vii. 22, 23 corresponds with Luke xiii. 25–27. Here Luke seems more original and older than Matthew, though a common source lies behind both (not, as Harnack thinks, Q). Dr Carpenter, who thinks that Luke as a whole is earlier than Matthew as a whole, makes some use of these passages. He points out that the rejected persons are in Luke, 'unbelieving Jews who will plead too late that they were old acquaintances, for it was in their midst that the Messiah had lived and taught; but the First Evangelist applies the doom of Jesus to some of his own professing followers who have even been distinguished by prophetic gifts and the power to do mighty works' (*First Three Gospels*, p. 300). It has

been maintained by many scholars, including Dr Carpenter, that the persons here attacked, false prophets and wonder-workers, are followers of Paul, antinomians, whom Matthew, the legalist, rejects from the Christian fold. So too to some extent J. Weiss, who speaks of the persons indicated as 'überpaulinische Christen.' As to the word 'lawlessness' (*ἀνομία*), upon which Dr Carpenter and Holtzmann too lay stress (the latter points out that Matthew has four times *ἀνομία* and never *ἀδικία*, whereas Luke has four times *ἀδικία* and never *ἀνομία*; Matt. vii. 23, xiii. 41, xxiii. 28, xxiv. 12; Luke xiii. 27, xvi. 8, 9, xviii. 6), the inferences to be drawn from it are combated by Jülicher in his *Einleitung*, p. 268. Nevertheless the weight of argument seems to lie on Dr Carpenter's side, though whether these phenomena, as well as the open 'assumption of Messianic authority' declared by Jesus in Matt. vii. 22, prove more than that Luke here, as in many other places, has kept more closely to his source, may be open to question.

24-27. THE HOUSE ON THE ROCK

(*Cp.* Luke vi. 47-49)

24 'Whoever then heareth these words of mine, and doeth them, shall be likened unto a wise man, who built his house upon the
25 rock: and the rain fell, and the streams came, and the winds blew and beat against that house; and it fell not: for it was founded
26 upon the rock. And every one that heareth these words of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, who built
27 his house upon the sand: and the rain fell, and the streams came, and the winds blew and struck against that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it.'

The essential necessity of 'works' is once more and finally urged by a sort of half metaphor, half parable. To hear and not to do shows that a man has only half heard. He is no true disciple whose faith does not issue in works. He *has* no *true* faith whose faith is not shown in his life. A man who 'hears' and does not 'do' is as foolish, and will come to as bad an end, as he who builds his house upon the sand. He who hears and does shows a character as wise and firm as the man whose house is built upon a rock. No storm can move him. It is possible, though M. Loisy thinks it unlikely, that the storms betoken persecutions. The practical thought ('not learning but doing is the chief thing') is thoroughly Jewish and Rabbinic.

If we regard the Sermon on the Mount as the charter of the 'Christianity' of Jesus, it is immensely striking how completely the Christological element is lacking. The new Law contains no article of faith concerning the person of its giver. It is silent about his Messiahship. There is no word about his divinity. We can seek to live in the spirit of the Sermon, and yet, like every Jew from Jesus's day to this, refuse to acknowledge any MAN as our religious 'Lord.'

28, 29. THE IMPRESSION PRODUCED BY THE TEACHING OF JESUS

(*Cp.* Mark i. 22; Luke iv. 32)

28 And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these words, the
29 people were amazed at his teaching: for he taught them as one
having authority, and not as their scribes.

28, 29. The substance of these verses is found, and is taken from, Mark i. 22. There is no reason for thinking that we have not here an authentic record of the impression which the teaching of Jesus made upon many of those who heard it. His teaching is fresher and more instinct with genius than that of the Rabbis, of whose teachings we have records in Talmud and Midrash. It is more inspired. It is grander. It is more prophetic. It seems to claim 'authority,' just as the prophets claimed it, because they were convinced that their words were from God. Such a consciousness of inspiration Jesus also must have possessed. *Cp.* for the use of *ἐξουσία*, Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, p. 48, n. 3. Merx thinks that *οἱ ὄχλοι* is interpolated. He has some authority for this, but his main reason is that he wants the Sermon to have been exclusively addressed to the disciples.

Looking back over the whole Sermon, one feels that one may not unjustly regard it as a meeting-ground and bond of union between Christian and Jew. For if the Sermon on the Mount be the charter of Christianity, if it contains the main principles of the religion of Jesus, it also contains nothing which is essentially antagonistic to Judaism. For most of its utterances there are abundant parallels in the Rabbinic literature. With tact and genius it picks out and combines and carries forward. The highest spirit of the Old Law is in harmony with the purest statement of the New.

How far is the religious and moral teaching of the Sermon on the Mount an improvement upon the teaching of the Old Testament? It is very common in books of Christian theology to speak of the imperfect or transitional or preparatory morality and religion of the Old Testament as compared with the perfect, permanent, or absolute morality and religion of the Gospel and the Sermon on the Mount. The liberal Jew is at no pains to defend every moral and religious statement in the Old Testament. He has not to try to turn black into white at all hazards and by every means. He recognizes that there are many passages in the Old Testament which teach an imperfect morality and an imperfect religion. But, on the other hand, these passages are almost invariably corrected by other passages which teach a morality and a religion that cannot be bettered or surpassed. Again, Judaism has developed on its own lines. Some of the 'imperfections' in the Old Testament are corrected in Rabbinic, mediæval, and modern Jewish literature, quite independently of the Gospels.

As regards the moral and religious teaching of the Sermon on the Mount, the liberal Jew can by no means subscribe to every word of it, or regard it as perfect and permanent. Passages such as v. 22 and vii. 14 are objectionable; they are as 'imperfect and transitional' as many a passage in the Old Testament. Passages such as v. 20, 34, 38–42, need qualification and restriction. The theology of a passage such as vii. 7 is open to considerable question. We must bring our critical judgment to bear upon the Sermon on the Mount as we must bring it to bear upon the Pentateuch. In some respects we have advanced beyond both.

To the Christian whose knowledge of Jewish literature and tradition ends with the Old Testament, passages such as v. 28, vi. 4, or vii. 5 must seem a splendid addition or 'perfection.' They seem less so to many Jews, to whom such teachings are already familiar. Yet to all men, whether Jew or Christian, the value of so much noble teaching, tersely and beautifully put and easily accessible, cannot be gainsaid.

The purely original portions of the Sermon on the Mount—*i.e.* those which do not harmonize with, or are not easily paralleled by, Rabbinic teaching and passages—are not very numerous. They are mainly: v. 10–12, 32, 38–48, vi. 6, 18, 33. The value of them to-day has, to some extent, been already discussed in the preceding notes. But the originality and greatness of the Sermon do not lie in any particular part of it. They lie in the whole. How much of it may go back to Jesus must be always uncertain. That the Sermon has grown from smaller groups and separate sayings is most probable. But it remains for all time a religious document of the highest nobility, significance, and power.

CHAPTER VIII

1–4. HEALING OF A LEPER

(*Cp.* Mark i. 40–45; Luke v. 12–16)

1 When he came down from the mountain, great crowds followed
2 him. And, behold, a leper came up and did him reverence, saying,
3 'Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.' And Jesus
stretched out his hand, and touched him, saying, 'I will; be thou
4 clean.' And immediately his leprosy was cleansed. And Jesus
said unto him, 'See thou tell no man; but go, show thyself to the
priest, and offer the sacrifice that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.'

Matthew, having now given a summary of the Master's teaching, proceeds to give examples of his wonderful deeds. Ten miracles are enumerated, one after the other (viii. 1–ix. 34). 'Ten illustrative stories are related in succession, and then the editor brings his narrative to a pause with a summary which he has before employed' (*F. T. G.* p. 281); ix. 35 repeats iv. 23.

The story is probably taken from Mark, but the finer touches are omitted. 'Pity' is too human a trait for the Jesus of Matthew, and the vehemence with which Jesus enjoins silence in Mark is also avoided. On the other hand, the leper 'worships' Jesus in Matthew, not in Mark.

The order not to mention the healing seems meaningless in Matthew, for the whole affair takes place in public. Its only justification would be the explanation given by Weiss and mentioned at the close of the note on Mark i. 45. But it is lame. For the rest see Mark i. 40–45. Matthew omits the healing of the demoniac in the Synagogue in Mark i. 23–28. He seems, as Mr Allen says, to have disliked the story. The leper story 'becomes the first miracle. The fact that this incident illustrates

Christ's attitude towards legal ceremonies may have cooperated in influencing the editor to place it immediately after the Sermon on the Mount' (Allen). B. Weiss (*Quellen*, A, pp. 160-162, B, p. 15) holds that the story of the leper is taken from Q, where it immediately followed the Sermon on the Mount even as it does in Matthew. This is doubtful. Nevertheless Loisy allows that Matthew may have known the source of Mark, 'et si cette source était le recueil de discours, cette anecdote pourrait appartenir à une rédaction secondaire où l'on tenait à représenter Jésus comme un fidèle observateur de la loi' (*E. S.* I. p. 124).

5-13. THE CENTURION AT CAPERNAUM

(*Cp.* Luke vii. 1-10, xiii. 28-30)

5 And when Jesus entered into Capernaum, there came unto
6 him a centurion, beseeching him, and saying, 'Lord, my boy lieth
7 at home paralyzed, in grievous torment.' And Jesus said unto
8 him, 'I will come and heal him.' The centurion answered and
said, 'Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst come under my
9 roof: but only speak the word, and my boy will be healed. For I
too am a man under authority, having soldiers under me: and I
say to this man, Go, and he goes; and to another, Come, and he
comes; and to my servant, Do this, and he does it.'

10 When Jesus heard it, he marvelled, and said to them that
followed, 'Verily I say unto you, Not even in Israel have I
11 found so great faith. And I say unto you, Many will come from
the east and west, and will sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and
12 Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the
kingdom will depart into the outer darkness: there will be the
13 weeping and the gnashing of teeth.' And Jesus said unto the
centurion, 'Go; as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee.'
And his boy was healed at that hour.

This story is not found in Mark. Perhaps Matthew inserted it in this place to indicate (immediately after the cure of a Jew) how the Gentile world also was within the range of Jesus's care and power. The story symbolizes the call of the Gentiles, and this is plainly indicated by the insertion of 11 and 12. It is one of the few stories which seem to have been included in Q.

The soldier is a heathen, not necessarily a Roman, in the service of Herod Antipas. παῖς (6) may be either servant or son. The latter seems more probable.

7. Wellhausen and others translate interrogatively, 'Am I to come and heal him?' Note that the healing takes place, not, as almost invariably in Mark, by a touch, but by a mere 'word.'

8, 9. Striking and famous verses. The combination of humility and faith is very fine and touching. But the words seem to reflect a Jewish point of view. Whether a heathen could really have spoken so is dubious.

11 and 12 occur Luke xiii. 28, 29, in another connection. They are inserted here by Matthew because this is the first occasion on which a heathen believes in Jesus (W.). The Messianic Kingdom under the figure of a meal is common and Rabbinic. Jesus teaches here 'the exact opposite of Jewish expectations.' For the Jews thought that the Gentiles would be 'put to shame at the sight of the Jews in bliss' (Plummer). In spite of J. Weiss, who holds that Jesus came to think thus at the end of his ministry, I believe that the verses were never said by him. Harnack, as the verses form part of Q, defends them. But is it fair to say that their 'Heidenfremdlichkeit' does not go beyond the limits which prophets had already reached? Had any prophet prophesied the *exclusion* of the Jews from the Kingdom? Dr Carpenter points out that the place of the words in Luke is more suitable than in Matthew. Jesus had so far found nothing but faith in Israel. Hence the words are in Matthew placed too soon, and so we have here 'additional evidence of the priority of Luke's representation' (*F. T. G.* p. 302). The Jews are the sons of the Kingdom in the sense that they had been chosen to inherit and possess it, but though the meal was originally prepared for them, they are to be excluded, and the guests are to be recruited from the big Gentile world.

These philo-Gentile sayings are wanting in Mark: in Matthew they are oddly combined with wholly opposite and contradictory utterances. The metaphors, says J. Weiss, must not be regarded as a dogmatic representation of hell. Perhaps not, but it is surely implied that those who are cast out will never be accepted. It seems disingenuous to say: 'Ueber das wirkliche Endschicksal der Ausgestossenen ist hier nichts ausgesagt.' For the origin of the phrase, 'weeping and gnashing of teeth,' see Clemen, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des neuen Testaments*, p. 133.

Is this story historical? It seems, W. says, to be a sort of double to, or variant of, the story of Jairus (Mark v. 22). The second clause of 10 implies that Jesus has been teaching a long time, which does not suit the place of the story in the Gospel. Loisy and J. Weiss regard the story as historical. The child recovered. Was it a coincidence, or more? We cannot say. 'Was der gewöhnliche Sinn für Zufall hält, wird dem Frommen, wie dem der es erlebt hat, als eine göttliche Fügung erscheinen.' This is hardly satisfactory. Harnack thinks the point of the story is the faith of the heathen soldier, not the miracle. In fact Matt. viii. 13 is not found in Luke's version, but only a statement that when they returned the slave was well. Hence Harnack concludes that the source (Q) either did not mention the healing at all, or that it was mentioned in a different way. Hence the likelihood for the authenticity of the story is increased. The argument does not seem very good. Is it conceivable that Q would have inserted the story unless it had ended with a miracle? Surely the faith of the heathen soldier must be substantiated.

The deductions to be drawn from the varying passages in Matthew—some hostile to heathen and Samaritan, and keen upon the Law and its observance, others of just opposite tendency—are disputed. W. holds that Matthew represents the point of view of the Jerusalem Christian Church. They are the true 'Jews'; they sacrifice and observe the Sabbath; they limit their missionary activity to Jews. Contradictions to this view are either apparent or interpolations. Jülicher, on the other hand, regards Matthew's 'legal' and 'Judaistic' utterances as due to his sources; his wider outlook is his own. The 'narrower' sayings—*e.g.* v. 17-19 —he himself would not have interpreted narrowly, any more than the Catholic Church after him has so interpreted them. The 'Law' is for him the moral law. Matthew is neither 'Pauline' nor anti-Pauline, but he represents the later harmony of the post-apostolic age. How far the 'legal' and 'narrower' sentences go back to Jesus, and what, if any do, he meant by them are quite different questions.

There can be little question that 11, 12 are found in a better connection in Luke than in Matthew. But whether the wording of the source (which is Q) is more closely given by Matthew or by Luke is disputed. Harnack thinks the former, B. Weiss (*Quellen*, A, p. 98, B, p. 58) the latter. Weiss argues that the way in which Matthew puts the inclusion of the Gentiles before the exclusion of the Jews points in its generality to a time after the destruction of Jerusalem when the rejection of Israel had already been sealed by fact. Moreover in Matthew it is all Israel, the people as such, who are excluded; in Luke only those who would not pass through the narrow gate of repentance. It is doubtful whether these devices and arguments are adequate to keep these verses, whether in Matthew's form or Luke's, for Jesus, and if they stood in Q, this only shows that some of Q is of a comparatively late date.

14–17. PETER'S MOTHER-IN-LAW

(*Cp.* Mark i. 29–34; Luke iv. 38–41)

14 And Jesus came into the house of Peter, and he saw his wife's
15 mother lying in bed with a fever. And he touched her hand, and
the fever left her: and she arose, and waited on him.
16 And when evening had come, they brought unto him many
that were possessed with demons: and he cast out the spirits with
17 a word, and healed all that were sick: that what was spoken by
Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled, saying, 'Himself he took our
sicknesses, and bore our diseases.'

Matthew now inserts the cure of Peter's mother-in-law as the second miracle wrought at Capernaum. He has to make sundry changes in the narrative on account of the change of place and time. So too as regards the healings after sunset. The point of the story in Mark i. 32–34 is spoiled in Matthew. In Mark, the cause of the crowd in the evening is that it was Saturday. When the sun set, the sick people were brought. Note that the healing by a mere 'word' is again emphasized. Moreover, whereas Mark says they brought all and Jesus healed many, Matthew says they brought many and he healed all.

The use of Isaiah liii. 4 is interesting. The 'pains' are the maladies which Jesus took away (*i.e.* removed), and by 'bearing our diseases' the Evangelist may possibly think of the trouble and labour which the healing of so many persons at so late an hour caused him (Weiss). It is likely enough that Jesus's cures may have exhausted him physically. For they demanded concentration of faith and will. But the entire quotation from Isaiah may, however, mean no more than that Jesus took away and removed men's diseases. So Loisy, and with good reason. The Greek translation of the Hebrew of Isaiah liii. 4 is not taken from the Septuagint. It seems to be an independent translation of the Hebrew.

18–22. CONDITIONS OF DISCIPLESHIP

(*Cp.* Luke ix. 57–62)

18 Now when Jesus saw great crowds around him, he gave
19 commandment to cross over to the other side. And a scribe came
up, and said unto him, 'Master, I will follow thee whithersoever

20 thou goest.' And Jesus said unto him, 'The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.'

21 And another of the disciples said unto him, 'Lord, allow me
22 first to go and bury my father.' But Jesus said unto him, 'Follow me; and let the dead bury their dead.'

18. Matthew again departs from the order of Mark's narrative, 'Jésus part pour la rive orientale du lac: c'est qu'il s'agit d'amener les miracles de la tempête apaisée et du possédé de Gérasa' (*E. S.* I. p. 125). Matthew wants to collect together a series of miracles and proceeds to tell the story of the storm. But after verse 18, which corresponds with Mark iv. 35, he inserts a short passage on the conditions of discipleship taken from Q. The insertion in this place is not very happy. The sentences find another home in Luke.

19. The first applicant, according to J. Weiss, was not alarmed by Jesus's reply, but became a disciple; according to Wellhausen, he was choked off or rejected. More prudently let us say with Loisy: 'La tradition ne savait pas ce que devint ce candidat au royaume' (*E. S.* I. p. 852).

According to W. the word 'scribe' is intended to raise a prejudice in the reader's mind. A 'scribe' is unlikely to become a true follower of Jesus. Note that the scribe addresses Jesus as Teacher; 'the other' addresses him as Lord. Yet this difference must not be pressed. Perhaps (with Harnack) 'a scribe' should be omitted. Luke has only 'some one.' In 21 we should perhaps omit 'of the disciples' and 'Lord,' as well as 'Teacher' in 19 (so Luke). We then get the text as it stood probably in Q. B. Weiss thinks differently. But the sense is much less dignified if we suppose that Matthew's text in 21 is right, and that a disciple is asking for 'Urlaub' (leave of absence). And in that case what meaning has πρῶτον? 'Before I follow you across the lake' is not enough. (*Quellen*, A, p. 100, B, p. 22.) Jesus's answer in 20 would only be possible at a late period of his ministry, but it seems to me very doubtful even then. Jesus never seems to have been in much actual danger, and till he reached Jerusalem, shortly before his death, he was always, more or less, among friends. He could find a house to lodge in quite easily. It is true he moved about from place to place, but there was no hardship in this; he was not hunted or in hiding.

This passage is one of the five instances in which Schmidt thinks that 'Son of man,' in its proper sense of meaning simply 'man,' goes back to Jesus himself. His interpretation, however, strikes me as exceedingly improbable. 'A scribe came to Jesus, and said: "Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest." Jesus answered: "The foxes have holes, and the birds of heaven nests, but *bar nasha—i.e.* man—has nowhere to lay his head." Man's life is full of danger and uncertainty. Where will he reside to-morrow? The beast is not deprived of house and hearth by his convictions. The saying may be a proverb quoted by Jesus, or an epigram coined on the spot. No doubt the scribe saw quickly the hint, without the thought ever crossing his mind that the Galilean teacher had in the same breath announced himself as the Messiah, and had complained that, though he was so great a man, he neither owned a house nor had a place in which to lodge overnight' (*Prophet of Nazareth*, p. 111). It may be argued that I have exaggerated the difficulty of keeping the saying for Jesus. For we remember how he had to leave the territory of Antipas, and how he moved about from place to place, and was unable to pass through Galilee on his way to Jerusalem except secretly or incognito. 'Son of man' may have been substituted for the personal pronoun. It may perhaps be implied that this wandering life is the natural and necessary condition of the ministry which Jesus is now fulfilling, and which those who want to become his disciples must also fulfil.

21. Luke's wording would allow one to suppose that the man was not yet a disciple. This is more natural. And it is also more natural and in accordance with the words 'follow me,' that the summons should be first spoken by Jesus, and then only that the man should ask permission to bury his father.

22. The saying, 'Let the dead bury their dead,' has become very famous. Its severity may perhaps be explained, with J. Weiss, by supposing either that Jesus fears that the relations of the petitioner will turn him from his purpose, or that Jesus believes that the real motive of the man's request is his fear of the long journey. 'Let the dead bury their dead' means: 'let the spiritually dead bury the physically dead.' The 'spiritually dead' would be 'those who had not felt the call to follow Christ, and were dead so far as he was concerned.' But it is possible that the words are 'a proverbial saying, meaning, cut yourself adrift from the past when matters of present interest call for your whole attention' (Allen).

More probably the order must be compared with such verses as Matt. x. 37; Luke xiv. 26, &c. The special needs of the hour explain, and perhaps justify, it. It would be unjust and unreasonable to exalt it into a principle for all times and seasons. A man would have to leave his father unburied to join his regiment in war. To proclaim the Kingdom of God (Luke ix. 60) was a still greater need. A great *dénouement*, a tremendous *περιπέτεια*, was at hand. Ordinary rules no longer apply. Loisy says: 'One must not seek to weaken the significance of the saying by bringing in the supposed particular needs of the man to whom it was spoken. The Evangelists want to put into relief the absolute character of the sacrifice which Jesus imposes on those who wish to follow him' (*E. S.* I. p. 853).

The story is doubtless modelled upon I Kings xix. 20. The records of Elijah and Elisha surely exercised a greater influence upon the doings of Jesus as described in the Synoptics than Wellhausen would allow. That 'let the dead bury their dead' is intended, as Holtzmann thinks, to rebuke the 'service of the dead,' which 'was specially prevalent at that time in Israel,' is unlikely. See Additional Note 42, and *cp.* ix. 23; Mark v. 38. Though the famous words are susceptible of an explanation which justifies them, there is no doubt that they, and such a phrase as 'hating one's parents' (Luke xiv. 26) (which has also a justifiable meaning), are, on the face of them, and as read by hostile critics, ready and anxious to pick holes and faults in Jesus's teaching, very offensive to a deep Jewish sentiment. The honouring of parents is so deeply rooted in the Jewish consciousness that these sayings of Jesus, though explicable and even justifiable, have a not wholly Jewish ring. We must, however, remember Deut. xxxiii. 9, which doubtless forms a sort of basis and starting point and source for them. The verse was practically ignored by Jewish tradition and feeling.

Moreover, it must be allowed that these somewhat un-Jewish sayings of Jesus produced un-Jewish results. 'The ethical precept of filial piety was changed by Christ. His Church was a militant church. He had come not to send peace but a sword.... According to Gregory the Great, we ought to ignore our parents, hating them and flying from them, when they are an obstacle to us in the way of the Lord; and this became the accepted theory of the Church. Nay, it was not only in similar cases of conflict that Christianity exercised a weakening influence on family ties which had previously been regarded with religious veneration. In all circumstances the relationship between child and parent was put in the shade by the relationship between man and God.... There are numerous legends and lives of saints in which the desertion of the nearest relations is recorded as one of the leading features of their sanctity, and as one of their chief titles to honour. Some Catholic writers were of opinion that a man might lawfully abandon his parents, even though they could not be supported without him, and enter religion, committing them to the care of

God. But Thomas Aquinas says that this would be tempting God, adding, however, that he who has already professed religion ought not, on any plea of supporting his parents, to quit the cloister in which he is buried with Christ, and entangle himself again in worldly business' (Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, Vol. I. pp. 537, 616).

23–27. STORM AT SEA

(*Cp.* Mark iv. 36–41; Luke viii. 22–25)

23 And when he had entered the boat, his disciples followed him.
24 And, behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea, so that the
25 ship was covered by the waves: but he was asleep. And they
26 came and awoke him, saying, 'Lord, help, we perish.' And he
said unto them, 'Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?' Then
he arose, and rebuked the winds and the sea; and there was
27 a great calm. But the men marvelled, saying, 'What sort of man
is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him!'

The story is told with greater freshness and point by Mark than by Matthew. Matthew's curtailments are not improvements. B. Weiss's arguments that the story in Mark is taken from Q, whom Matthew has more faithfully reproduced, are not convincing (*Quellen*, A, pp. 166–169).

28–34. THE GADARENE DEMONIACS

(*Cp.* Mark v. 1–20; Luke viii. 26–39)

28 And when he had come to the other side, to the country of the
Gergesenes, two men possessed with demons met him, coming out
from the tombs, who were so violent that no man could pass by
29 that way. And, behold, they cried out, saying, 'What have we to
do with thee, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment
30 us before the time?' And a good way off from them there was an
31 herd of many swine, feeding. So the demons besought him,
32 saying, 'If thou cast us out, send us into the herd of swine.' And
he said unto them, 'Go.' So they came out, and went into the
herd of swine: and, behold, the whole herd of swine rushed down
33 the cliff into the lake, and perished in the waters. And the

swineherds fled, and went into the city, and reported everything, and also what had happened to those who were possessed by the
34 demons. And, behold, the whole city came out to meet Jesus: and when they saw him, they besought him to depart out of their territory.

Matthew lets his next story follow the order of Mark. He shortens considerably. The one demoniac is turned into two, either because Mark i. 23–26 is omitted in Matthew, who here, as it were, joins the two cases together, or in order to lessen the contrast between the one human being and the legion of demons. Peculiar to Matthew is the expression in 29, 'before the time,' *i.e.* before the Last Judgment and their final and permanent damnation. For the rest see notes on Mark. B. Weiss, again, wants to show that the swine story stood in Q. Loisy says cautiously: 'La sobriété du récit (de Matthieu) pourrait tenir en partie à ce que Matthieu a connu la source dont Marc lui-même dépend' (*E. S.* I. p. 125).

CHAPTER IX

1–8. HEALING OF A PARALYTIC

(*Cp.* Mark ii. 1–12; Luke v. 17–26)

1 And he entered into a boat, and crossed over, and came to his
2 own city. And, behold, they brought to him a paralyzed man,
lying on a bed: and Jesus, seeing their faith, said unto the
paralyzed man: 'Son, be of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven thee.'
3 And, behold, certain of the scribes said among themselves, 'This
4 man blasphemes.' And Jesus perceiving their thoughts said,
5 'Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts? For which is easier:
to say, Thy sins are forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and walk?
6 But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth
to forgive sins,'—then said he to the paralyzed man, 'Arise,
7 take up thy bed, and go home.' And he arose, and went home.
8 But when the crowd saw it, they were afraid, and glorified God,
who had given such power unto men.

Matthew now harks back to Mark ii. 1–22 and inserts the matter contained therein between his version of the Gerasene pigs and that of Jairus's daughter. The story of the Paralytic is considerably shortened. The reference to 'faith' becomes less cogent owing to the omission of the crowd and of the incident of the roof. Of this story too Loisy observes that Matthew may depend both on Mark and on Mark's source, while B. Weiss assumes that the common source is Q.

The noteworthy words in 8, 'who had given such power *unto men*,' are dealt with in the note on Mark ii. 10. Mr Allen tries to weaken their force, and the inference, which W., and others who think with him, would make from them, by observing that if Jesus had the power to forgive sins, then 'this power can be said to have been given to mankind as represented by him.' This argument seems to me weak. It may be 'pedantic' to see in 'men' a proof that the *editor* regarded Son of man as equivalent to mankind. It is not pedantic to see in 'men' a proof that in the original Aramaic source 'Son of man' here meant simply 'man' or 'men.'

Dr Abbott holds that Jesus did indeed give this power unto men. His book, *Through Nature to Christ* (1877), which seems to me (if I may venture to criticize the work of a man so many times wiser, abler, and more learned than I) to be onesided in its treatment both of the 'Scribes and Pharisees' on the one hand, and of Jesus upon the other, is perhaps nowhere more interesting and suggestive than in the treatment of forgiveness (Chapters XIII and XVI). Dr Abbott urges that forgiveness means far more than merely giving up a penalty. The forgiver 'must spiritually lift up the person he forgives,' and he does this by a certain attitude of his own mind. He must have a hatred of sin, a love of man, and a faith in God as the Father of men, a faith in men as the children of God. By his sympathy, faith, and spiritual force he can confirm and strengthen the weak and wavering repentance of a sinner. If such a man is a father, and 'accepts his child's contrition and penitence, though it be for a sin not committed directly against himself, and tells the little one that he is forgiven, and that now he will be a good child and sin no more like that again—is the father overstepping the bounds of the duties of fatherhood, or is the child wrong in going its way with its heart at rest and with a sense of burden lightened and peace restored? Surely we are bound to admit that every human being, so far as he has the powers that naturally go to make up the forgiving act—I mean love, trust, self-subordination, and hatred of sin—must also have the power of forgiving sins, not only in his own name, but also in the name of society, and even in the name of God Himself. And if this be so between father and children, then it must be within the experience of all that there are persons so highly endowed with the spiritual gifts of faith and love and the hatred of sin that they tower above the ordinary average man as much as fathers above their children. Such men must be recognized as specially adapted by nature, that is by God, for the divine task of forgiving.' Such men's 'hopes will be purer and higher,' their 'hatred of selfishness and of meanness will be more intense,' their 'sympathy with the wretched and sinful more powerful,' their 'judgment at once more just and more charitable than in ordinary men. Now such men as these cannot live without lifting up those with whom they live. You go forth from their presence refreshed, with a distinct sense of having been lightened of a burden of selfishness, with better hopes, better aims, with a wholesome self-reproach leading to a wholesome self-respect. A few such men can make a great nation or a great church. But everyone has, or may have, something of this power; and it was this power that Jesus came to give to common men. It might have been described as the power of love, or the power of faith, or the power of hope; but any one of these terms would have been inadequate. Forgiveness presupposes and includes them all, and exhibits them all in action.' These suggestive and eloquent words doubtless give some explanation of the power claimed and exercised by Jesus in the forgiveness of sins. It may, however, be questioned whether they are not a little too modern. They seem to apply fairly well to Luke vii. 36–50, but they hardly apply so well to Matt. ix. 1–8. The great point in this story is the miracle. It is this which proves, and indeed *is*, the forgiveness. Jesus does not even say to the man, 'Go, and sin no more.' He seems especially concerned in exhibiting his peculiar and miraculous power, such as he only could exercise. Whether the story was in reality quite different nobody can say. One can only deal with it as it stands.

4. 'Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts?' The evil is the wickedness which they impute to him.

9–13. THE CALL OF MATTHEW: JESUS EATS WITH SINNERS AND TAX-COLLECTORS

(*Cp.* Mark ii. 13–17; Luke v. 27–32)

9 And as Jesus passed by from there, he saw a man, named Matthew, sitting at the tax house: and he said unto him, 'Follow me.' And he arose, and followed him.

10 And it came to pass, as Jesus sat at table in the house, behold,
many tax-collectors and sinners came and sat down with him and
11 his disciples. And when the Pharisees saw it, they said unto his
disciples, 'Why does your Master eat with tax-collectors and
12 sinners?' But when Jesus heard it, he said, 'The strong have no
13 need of the physician, but they that are sick. But go ye and
learn what it meaneth: I desire mercy, and not sacrifice: for
I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.'

The tax-collector is called Levi in Mark; 'the difference in the names is inexplicable' (W.). It is not certain that the tax-collector Levi was for Mark the same as the apostle Matthew of

Mark iii. 18. The redactor of the first Gospel may have made the identification himself. 'If the first Gospel, which is certainly not the work of an apostle or of a witness of Christ's life, has, nevertheless, been attributed to the apostle Matthew, it is quite likely that the last redactor was partly responsible for this, and that, from the first, the book was given out, if not as having been written by Matthew, at all events as being closely connected with him and his Hebrew Gospel; this being the case, the redactor was perhaps anxious to give prominence to the figure of the apostle; with this end in view he would wish that the call of the latter should be described as that of the four fishermen had been, and finding in Mark an account, as it seemed to him, of an apostolic call, although the person called did not figure in the catalogue of the Twelve, he may deliberately have substituted Matthew for Levi, without being authorized by any tradition whatsoever, and without even believing in their identity. For if he had supposed this, he would have preferred to indicate it in the text by saying "Levi, said to be Matthew," in order to make a connection with the oldest tradition; if he suppressed the name of Levi, it was because this name had no traditional significance; nor is there anything to prove that he knew of Matthew as a tax-collector, but, by giving him Levi's place, he was obliged to make him a tax-collector' (*E. S.* I. p. 486).

13. The words 'Go...sacrifice' are not found in Mark, and interrupt the connection. The quotation from Hosea recurs in xii. 7. Nevertheless, the motive of pity here given for Jesus's exceptional conduct is quite in keeping with his character.

14–17. FASTING

(*Cp.* Mark ii. 18–22; Luke v. 33–39)

14 Then the disciples of John came to him, saying, 'Why do we
15 and the Pharisees fast, but thy disciples fast not?' And Jesus
said unto them, 'Can the wedding guests mourn, as long as the
bridegroom is with them? But the days will come, when the
16 bridegroom will be taken from them, and then they will fast. No
man putteth a piece of undressed cloth on to an old garment, for,
if he do, the patch draggeth away from the garment, and the rent
17 is made worse. Neither do men pour new wine into old wine
skins: for, if they do, the skins burst, and the wine runneth out,
and the skins perish: but they pour new wine into new skins, and
both are preserved.'

The questioners in Mark are disciples of John and some 'Pharisees'; in Matthew the former only. Originally, as W. observes, the questioners were probably not specially named. 'Some came and asked.'

The additional words of Matthew in 17 should be noted. The necessity of new skins (*i.e.* new forms) is specially emphasized. New doctrine needs new forms.

18–26. The Daughter of Jairus and the Woman with an Issue

(*Cp.* Mark v. 21–43; Luke viii. 40–56)

18 While he was speaking these words unto them, behold, a ruler
came up, and fell down before him, saying, 'My daughter has just
died: but come, and lay thy hand upon her, and she will live.'
19 And Jesus arose, and followed him, with his disciples.

20 And, behold, a woman, who had had an issue of blood for twelve
years, came behind him, and touched the tassel of his garment:
21 for she said to herself, 'If I only touch his garment, I shall be
22 healed.' But Jesus turned round, and saw her, and said, 'Daughter,
be of good cheer; thy faith hath healed thee.' And the woman
was healed from that hour.

23 And when Jesus came into the ruler's house, and saw the flute
24 players and the people making an uproar, he said unto them,
'Depart: for the maiden is not dead, but sleepeth.' And they
25 laughed him to scorn. But when the people were driven out, he
26 went in, and took her by the hand, and the girl arose. And the
report of it went out into all that land.

Matthew now returns to Mark's fifth chapter, which he had already used in viii. 28–34. Mark's narrative is considerably abbreviated. The reason, says W., why Matthew has inserted these miracles and the following two (27–34) here is to be found in xi. 5. There Jesus says that he has healed the blind and deaf, and raised the dead. Hence examples of such wonders had to be given. Hence, too, the child is said by the 'ruler' to have just died. In Mark, Jairus only says that she is dangerously ill. As to the reason for these changes, it is not necessary to assume with B. Weiss that Matthew's version is taken from Q. We may, with Holtzmann, hold that Matthew merely desired to emphasize and heighten the miracle. He wants to make it appear without doubt that here was a clear case of restoring the dead to life, and that Jesus was the match of, and superior to, Elijah and Elisha. As Loisy says, his methods show a great liberty in the manipulation of the traditional records and stories. As to the changes in the story of the Woman with an issue, see notes on Mark. The realistic touches in Mark, how Jesus 'perceived that power had gone forth from him,' and how the crowd pressed round him, are omitted by Matthew.

27–34. Two Blind Men and a Dumb Man are Healed

27 And when Jesus passed on from there, two blind men followed
28 him, crying, and saying, 'Pity us, son of David.' And when he
had come into the house, the blind men came to him, and Jesus
said unto them, 'Have ye faith that I am able to do this?' They
29 said unto him, 'Yes, Lord.' Then he touched their eyes, saying,
30 'According to your faith be it done unto you.' And their eyes
were opened. And Jesus sternly charged them, saying, 'See that
31 no man know it.' But they departed and spread abroad his fame
in all that country.

32 As they went out, behold, there was brought to him a dumb
33 man possessed with a demon. And when the demon was expelled,
the dumb man spoke: and the crowd marvelled, saying, 'Never
34 yet was such a thing seen in Israel.' But the Pharisees said,
'Through the prince of the demons he expels the demons.'

These stories, also intended to prove the statement in xi. 5, are made up by anticipating, or, as it were, doubling miracles which are given elsewhere,—*i.e.* in xx. 29–34 and xii. 22–24. Compare the parallels in Mark (vii. 31–37, viii. 22–26, x. 46–52). The severe and disobeyed order in 30 recalls Mark i. 43–45, viii. 26. Thus we have here editorial miracles, drawn up to complete the number ten and to prepare for xi. 5. A comparison of Matt. ix. 33, 34 with Luke xi. 14 makes it probable that Matthew is in these verses drawing on Q. That source introduced the speech about Beelzebul with a very brief narrative of a miracle of healing, and it is this narrative which is here used by Matthew. When Matthew comes to the Beelzebul speech, for which he is again dependent upon Q, he has to recount the miracle again, which he does in somewhat altered language (xii. 22–24). ix. 34 is less in place here than in xii. 24 (*cp.* Loisy, *E. S.* I. p. 699; B. Weiss, *Quellen*, A, pp. 103, 115, B, p. 35).

35–x. 4. The Sending of the Disciples

(*Cp.* Mark vi. 6, 7, 34, iii. 14–19; Luke ix. i, x. 1, 2, vi. 12–16)

35 And Jesus went about in all the cities and villages, teaching
in their synagogues, and proclaiming the Good Tidings of the
36 kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease. But when
he saw the people, he was moved with compassion for them, because
they were harassed and prostrate, as sheep having no shepherd.
37 Then said he unto his disciples, 'The harvest is large, but the
38 labourers are few; beseech, therefore, the lord of the harvest, that
he send out labourers into his harvest.'

X. 1 And he called unto him his twelve disciples, and gave them
power to cast out unclean spirits, and to heal every sickness and
2 every disease. Now the names of the twelve apostles are these:
first, Simon, who was called Peter, and Andrew his brother;
3 James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother; Philip, and
Bartholomew; Thomas, and Matthew the tax-collector; James the
4 son of Alphæus, and Lebbæus; Simon the Canaanite, and Judas
Iscariot, who also betrayed him.

The ten miracles having been related, Matthew now introduces us to a fresh discourse. He starts his introduction to it with a verse similar to one he had used just before the Sermon on the Mount (iv. 23). The discourse itself is suggested by what he found in Mark. For, reserving the failure in Nazareth for a later occasion, Matthew came next to the mission of the disciples (Mark vi. 7–13). He had not already told of their election, but he now assumes it, only pausing to give their names (Mark iii. 14–19). Then, after a short introduction, he proceeds to give the discourse which Jesus made to them when he despatched them upon their mission.

35. *Cp.* iv. 23, but also Mark vi. 6.

36–38. Matthew inserts these verses before he comes to Mark vi. 7.

36. Matthew borrows here from Mark vi. 34. 'He was moved with pity.' In this pity, this profound and yearning compassion, there lies probably a true and fundamental characteristic of the historic Jesus. For cruelty, pride, hypocrisy, and self-righteous-

ness, he had few reservations of language or condemnation; but for those who were more sinned against than sinning, for the degraded, the outcast and the shunned, for the flotsam and jetsam of humanity, for those outside the pale of respectability and law, he could make excuses and find compassion. He longed to redeem them; to bring them near again to their Father and his Father, from whom they seemed so distant, of whom they seemed so rejected, to show them that peace and happiness and redemption from the bondage of sin could freely be theirs. Through human love he revealed to them God's love. Through human sympathy he made them understand the sympathy of God. The redemptive work of Christianity, the labours of faithful women among the outcast and the fallen, are the greatest tribute to the religious power of the Master, the best witness to the beauty of his life and the nobility of his teaching. So far as we can tell, this pity for the sinner was a new note in religious history. Its immense importance and fruitfulness need not be enlarged upon here.

ἐσκυλμένοι, 'worn out,' 'wearied,' 'harassed'; literally 'flayed,' 'skinned.'

ἐριμμένοι, 'scattered,' 'prostrate.' But W. translates '*verstossen*,' 'cast away,' 'rejected.' He thinks that the Biblical equivalent must be sought in passages like Zech. xi. 16. Weiss renders 'erschöpft hingestreckt.' *Cp.* Jer. xiv. 16: ἐριμμένοι, in the streets of Jerusalem.

As to the question of the historical character of the 'scattered and wearied' crowd, and whether they constituted an important or insignificant element of the total Jewish population at the time, see Additional Note 43.

37, 38. *Cp.* Luke x. 2. Were these verses, as Loisy and B. Weiss think, the exordium to the oration to the disciples in Q? Usually, as W. points out, the harvest is the end of the world, or Last Judgment, and the reapers are the angels. Whether the verses are authentic is disputed. J. Weiss would wish to regard them so. They belong, he thinks, to a hopeful, early period of Jesus's ministry. It is implied that there are *many* people who might enter the Kingdom, if enough workers can be found to bring them in. Jesus has not yet a number of disciples around him, but urges his hearers to ask for such helpers from God. To W. the request does not quite fit in with the 'tatkräftiges Eingreifen Jesu,' who in the next chapter sends out his own workers into the harvest field.

x. 1. Mark vi. 7. In Mark, Jesus gives the apostles 'authority over the unclean spirits.' In Q, according to B. Weiss, Jesus only gave authority to the disciples to cure diseases (see Luke x. 17).

Matthew has combined Q's account with that of Mark. In Mark, the selection of the Twelve is separated by a suitable interval from their despatch upon independent missionary work. See Mark iii. 13 and vi. 7. In Matthew the call of the apostles is omitted. Jesus in this place merely calls them to him. They have already been selected. But Matthew takes the opportunity to give their names.

CHAPTER X

5-xi. 1. THE DISCOURSE TO THE APOSTLES

(*Cp.* Mark vi. 8-11; Luke vi. 40, ix. 2-5, x. 3-12, 16, xii. 2-12,
51-53, xiv. 26, 27, xvii. 33)

5 These twelve Jesus despatched, and commanded them, saying,
'Take not your way to the heathen, and enter into no city of the
6 Samaritans: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of
7 Israel. And as ye go, proclaim, saying, The kingdom of heaven
8 hath drawn near. Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead,
9 cast out demons: ye received gratis; give gratis. Provide your-
10 selves with no gold, or silver, or brass in your girdles; with no
wallet for the journey, or two coats, or shoes, or staff: for the
11 labourer is worthy of his food. And into whatever city or village
ye enter, enquire who in it is worthy; and there abide till ye go
12 13 thence. And when ye come into the house, salute it. And if the
house be worthy, let your peace come upon it: but if it be not
14 worthy, let your peace return to you. And whoever shall not
receive you, or hear your words, depart out of that house or city,
15 and shake off the dust from your feet. Verily I say unto you, It
shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha on
the Day of Judgment than for that city.

16 'Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be
17 ye therefore clever as serpents, and innocent as doves. Take heed
of men: for they will deliver you up to the councils, and they will
18 scourge you in their synagogues; and ye will be brought before
governors and kings for my sake, to bear witness to them and to
19 the heathen. But when they deliver you up, be not anxious how
or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that hour what

20 ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your
21 Father which speaketh in you. And brother shall deliver up
brother unto death, and the father the child: and children shall
22 rise up against parents, and cause them to be put to death. And
ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that en-
23 dureth to the end, he shall be saved. But when they persecute
you in one city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye
shall not finish the cities of Israel, before the Son of man hath come.

24 'A disciple is not above his master, nor a servant above his
25 lord. It sufficeth for the disciple that he be as his master, and
the servant as his lord. If they called the master of the house
26 Beelzebul, how much more them of his household? So fear them
not. For there is nothing hidden that shall not be disclosed; and
27 concealed, that shall not be known. What I tell you in the dark-
ness, that speak in the light: and what ye hear in your ear, that
28 proclaim upon the housetops. And fear not them who kill the
body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him who is
29 able to destroy both soul and body in hell. Are not two sparrows
sold for a penny? and not one of them falleth to the ground with-
30 out your Father. But of you even the hairs of your head are all
31 numbered. So fear ye not; ye are of more value than many
32 sparrows. Whoever, then, shall acknowledge me before men, him
33 will I too acknowledge before my Father who is in heaven. But
whoever denieth me before men, him will I also deny before my
Father who is in heaven.

34 'Think not that I came to bring peace on earth: I came not to
35 bring peace, but a sword. For I came to set a man at variance
against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the
36 daughter in law against her mother in law. And a man's foes will
37 be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother
more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or
38 daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh
39 not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. He
that hath found his life shall lose it: and he that hath lost his life
for my sake shall find it.

40 'He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me
41 receiveth him that sent me. He that receiveth a prophet in the
name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward; and he that

receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall
42 receive a righteous man's reward. And whoever shall give one of
these little ones but a cup of cold water to drink in the name
of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his
reward.'

XI. 1 And when Jesus had finished his injunctions to his twelve disciples, he departed thence to teach and to preach in their cities.

The speech (made up mainly from Q and Mark) can be divided into two main sections, of which the first ends, as some think, at 15, as others think, at 16. For 5–15 the parallel in Mark is vi. 8–11.

5, 6 are peculiar to Matthew. They form one of his anti-Gentile remarks. He includes, in the strangest way, some very philo-Gentile and anti-Jewish statements, and some which point precisely in the reverse direction.

Here the mission is practically limited to Galilee, as between Galilee and Judæa comes Samaria. The 'lost sheep' are, therefore, presumably to be specially found in Galilee. As to Galilee and its religious condition, see Additional Note 40. Perhaps, however, with M. Loisy, verses 6 and 23 make it probable that the point of view is not 'geographic,' but ethnographic.

The simplest explanation of these verses is that they are taken from Q. It did not matter to Matthew that Jesus should have limited this first mission to Israel. For by his time the question was settled. The Church included both Jews and Gentiles. Luke omitted the verses, because they did not suit with the mission of the Seventy. Moreover, they would jar upon Luke more than upon Matthew, to whom Israel, apart from the Scribes and Pharisees, was of greater interest and value than it was to Luke, the Gentile. The prohibition of preaching the Gospel to heathen or Samaritans is in conformity with the historical situation, and with what actually may have occurred. Hence it may even belong to Jesus himself.

M. Loisy is very reasonable on the nationalism of the original 'Gospel' of Jesus. 'The Christ did not come forward as the founder of a new religion, or even as the reformer of the traditional religion; he came for the accomplishment of the great hope, and he does not seem to have been anxious to spread that hope where it did not yet exist. He was sent and he addresses himself only to the Jews....The evangelization of the pagan world was an idea foreign to his preaching; even after his death the apostles believed that the End would come before the Gospel had been carried to all the cities of Palestine (x. 23). Nevertheless, Gentiles are not wholly excluded from the Kingdom. *Cp.* Matt. viii. 11, 12. Chosen Gentiles will take the place of outcast Jews. Yet the Kingdom of heaven remains a Kingdom of Israel in celestial form: the Gentiles, as in the higher passages of the prophets, are only joined to Israel, and one cannot say that humanity without distinction is welcomed and bidden draw near to God, or else one must recognize that from this particular point of view Israel becomes almost identified with humanity....The formula of the condemnation of Jesus, which is also the most authentic expression of the mission which he attributed to himself, attests that the *cadre* of his office remains *national*, just like the Kingdom of God. It is King of the Jews' (*E. S.* I. pp. 229, 230, 241).

7, 8. *Cp.* Luke ix. 2, x. 9. The disciples are to proclaim the imminence of the Kingdom. In Mark vi. 12 they preach repentance. The connection of the two is indicated in Mark i. 15. They are also, as regards the sick and the afflicted, to have similar powers, and to work similar cures, to those of their Master Verse 8 has no equivalent in Luke except as regards 'healing the sick,' which we find both in Luke ix. 2 and x. 9. And it is only this part of the verse which B. Weiss thinks goes back to Q or to Jesus. The order to raise the dead, cleanse the lepers and expel the demons has been added by Matthew. The original speech in Q has been best preserved by Luke in his tenth chapter. The arguments of Weiss as to the 'Aussendungsrede,' developed in *Quellen*, A, pp. 124-131, B, pp. 25-29, are extremely ingenious.

9, 10. *Cp.* Mark vi. 8, 9; Luke ix. 3, x. 4. No money is to be received by them for their preaching: the mission is to bring no pecuniary profit. If μὴ κτήσησθε means 'do not acquire,' as Holtzmann, Pfleiderer, and others suppose, the injunction contained in the last words of 8 is continued in the opening of 9. They are not to acquire money by being paid for their teaching. If this be the meaning of μὴ κτήσησθε, we see that Matthew has modified the words of the source which he followed, but that he has not modified them enough. It makes sense to say, 'do not acquire gold,' but not, 'do not *acquire* coats and shoes.' But W. thinks that the words μὴ κτήσησθε can be rendered by, 'do not provide yourselves with,' 'do not acquire (for the journey),' in which case the clause is a mere close parallel to Mark vi. 8, 9, and only differs in forbidding the use of stick and sandals which Mark permits. *Cp.* Luke ix. 3, x. 4. M. Loisy thinks that the more stringent prohibition is perhaps more in accordance with the spirit of Jesus and the circumstances of the first mission. 'Les apôtres, allant de village en village, dans un rayon peu étendu, ne feront jamais de bien longues courses, et ils se remettront absolument à la Providence, évitant toutes les précautions coutumières aux voyageurs' (*E. S.* I. p. 871). B. Weiss thinks the original order is found in Luke x. 4. No purse, wallet, shoes.

'The labourer is worthy of his food.' The meaning is that the disciples will be fed and housed by those to whom they come and tell the welcome news: thus provision and payment are unnecessary.

The order not to take payment for spiritual work is quite in accordance with Rabbinic custom and precept. See Additional Note 44. It indicates a later period than Mark, who only said that the disciples were not to take money with them. Here they are not to *make* money. Pfleiderer thinks the change reflects the later experiences and warnings indicated in 1 Tim. vi. 5; 1 Peter v. 2. The Gospel is not to be a source of gain. The prohibition is only in Matthew; it is not in Luke, and we may infer that it was not in Q, but was added by Matthew.

11–14. *Cp.* Mark vi. 10, 11; Luke ix. 4, 5, x. 5–11. The τόπος in Mark, says W., is equivalent to the house in Matthew. The city seems to indicate a later period of tradition. Originally it was a question of the disciple's reception in a house, where, taken in as a mere guest, he reveals himself as a missionary. The case of the disciples not even being received into a town seems to point to a time when it was already well known for what purpose they came. Harnack brings weighty arguments for denying this. He thinks that preaching in houses and in cities went together. Both are alluded to in Q. Nor does he think that W. is right in identifying Mark's τόπος with a house. It is rather the city.

B. Weiss again pleads for the priority of Luke's version to Matthew's. Luke gives the original Q. Jesus bids his disciples attempt a 'Hausmission' only. They are to go to one house, and remain there, and speak there. For public preaching in synagogues, in market places or on mountains, they were not yet (he knew) ripe.

11. 'Enquire who in it is worthy.' Matthew only. A precaution suggested, it has been remarked, by some painful experiences of the early Christian missionaries and preachers.

12. The commentators call attention to the importance and efficacy of salutations in the East. For 14, *cp.* Acts xiii. 51.

15. *Cp.* Luke x. 12.

16. This verse occurs (in part) in Luke x. 3. It is doubtful whether it should be regarded as ending the section 5–15 or as beginning the section 17–22. According to Loisy the redactor meant it to introduce and pave the way for that second section, but originally Loisy supposes that it belonged to the first part and was followed by 23. In that case it would allude to the perils the apostles might encounter in the cities of Galilee and Judæa.

But what were these grave perils? How unlikely either that Jesus could have anticipated them or that the apostles (if their journey is historic) encountered them at all! Loisy seems rather specially keen to keep as much of the chapter for Jesus as he can, but he admits that 'l'avis pourrait bien plutôt n'appartenir qu'à une rédaction secondaire du discours' (*E. S.* I. p. 875). B. Weiss's suggestion is ingenious, but strained. He holds that the verse in Q came at the beginning of the speech, as in Luke x. 3, and that Luke's version contains Q's wording. The disciples are compared with *ἄρνες* which does not here mean lambs or sheep, but rams; the wolves are the false teachers, the disciples are to be the leaders of the flock, the wethers, for the Scribes and Rabbis who should have been rams and leaders, have become wolves. The only shepherd of the flock is Jesus himself, so he can only describe his disciples as rams. This is very unlikely. As Loisy says: it is not the rams who defend the flock against the wolves; it is the shepherds. The difficulties of the verse are not to be got over by the proposed interpretation.

The desired combination of prudence and simplicity is interesting. The need of the first in the face of enemies seems clear, and may be illustrated by Jesus himself when he cleverly extricates himself, by evasive replies, from entrapping and tricky questions. The second apparently refers to the hope of obtaining converts: for that simplicity and sincerity are requisite.

17–22. *Cp.* Luke xii. 11, 12. This section, at all events, is clearly of late date. If the despatch of the apostles is historic, and if any speech to them was made by Jesus of which we have remnants, these verses could have formed no part of it. They describe later conditions and later persecutions. In Mark parallel descriptions are found in the apocalyptic oration, xiii. 9–13 (*cp.* Matt. xxiv. 9–14; Luke xxi. 12–19).

17. The 'synagogues' are here synonymous with 'synedria,' or 'courts of justice.' The continued existence of Jewish jurisdiction is assumed. Thus the date is, at any rate, earlier than 70 A.D.

18. This verse seems to speak of heathen persecution as well as Jewish. Elsewhere the horizon seems limited to Judæa (W.).

23. An interesting verse peculiar to Matthew. It may have been adapted for its present place, but its second half seems to show a distinct and separate signification. It seems to mean: you will not have got through your missionary labours in the cities of Israel before the Son of man comes: not, you will not exhaust the cities, in your flight from one to the other, before the Son of man comes, which would be a very odd remark.

Hence Loisy connects it with 16, 'when you are badly received in one city, or when you are chased away from one city, pass on to another.' The truth is, as W. remarks, that the mission of the apostles and the later persecutions are here mixed up together inextricably. 'Die Christen werden eben besonders durch ihre eifrige und erfolgreiche Propaganda den Hass der Juden erregt haben; und gerade die Missionare werden xxiii. 34 von Stadt zu Stadt verfolgt. Der Menschensohn ist nach der Absicht des Konzipienten nicht Jesus.' This last sentence is doubtful.

As usual, the End is believed to be near at hand. Before the mission to Israel is over the end of the existing order will have arrived. The Christian missionaries will be persecuted by the Jews. Doubtless this reflects the historical situation between the death of Jesus and the fall of the Temple. The Jews of that time were not tolerant, and we have no reason to suppose that they did not persecute those who sought to win fresh adherents to the dead prophet of Nazareth. The verse sharply limits missionary activity to Israel, and hence, too, the Messianic salvation; it is in contradiction with such passages as xxiv. 14, xxviii. 19. Matthew must have found this verse in his sources, as he found x. 5. Pfleiderer says: 'Words of this kind which fit in with the narrow Jewish-Christian outlook of the source are omitted by the other Evangelists, but have been preserved by Matthew, not as if he had himself still shared this narrow outlook, but simply because they belonged to the oldest tradition, and their preservation appeared to be no longer practically dangerous in the existing circumstances of the Church' (*Urchristentum*, I. p. 574).

M. Loisy, as we have seen, maintains the historic character of the charge to, and mission of, the apostles in the lifetime of Jesus during his Galilæan period. There is both a historic kernel, and there is also much that is later than Jesus, in the words which are put into his mouth. The mission was, as a fact, confined to Jews, and did not include heathen or Samaritans; yet 5, and 6, and 23 are probably not authentic. 'Someone may subsequently have felt an interest in emphasizing in the discourse what had been true in fact.' As to 23: 'It is the Judaizing Christians who may have believed that Jesus would return before the preaching of the apostles had reached all the towns of Palestine.' 'The promise of Jesus has no meaning in connection with the first mission of the apostles, but it corresponds to the period when the Twelve looked upon themselves as charged to preach the Gospel to the Jews alone; it assumes also the imminence of the Parousia.' 'The prophecy is as clear as it was unverified. But it reflects at least as much the ardent faith of the early community as the formal teaching of Jesus' (*E. S.* I. pp. 866, 883, 884).

24, 25. The date of these sentences is also clearly after the death of Jesus. xii. 24 is anticipated. The disciple cannot expect a better lot than the Master: *i.e.* defamation and martyrdom. Matthew has used an older saying (*cp.* Luke vi. 40) and given it a new meaning.

26. For the section 26–33, *cp.* Luke xii. 2–9. B. Weiss and Harnack suppose that the whole passage is taken from Q, which would, to my mind, again imply that the 'edition' of Q which Matthew and Luke employed, attributed many sayings to Jesus which were only written and composed after his death. Verse 26 is perhaps based upon Mark iv. 22 where, however, the adage has a different meaning and application. Here this verse and 27 assume that Jesus during his lifetime was little known, and that his wider influence only began after his death. His disciples are not to shrink from proclaiming before the world what Jesus said and did within a small circle (W.).

28. The allusion is to the danger of martyrdom. He who can destroy both soul and body in hell is (not the devil, but) God. (The God of the Gospel and the New Testament is by no means only to be loved! He is much to be feared also!) J. Weiss points out that this distinction between 'body' and 'soul' is rather Greek than Hebrew. (In 39 we have the ordinary use of 'soul' for 'life.') Luke's phraseology, xii. 4–6, is perhaps more original. S.S. reads 'throw' for 'destroy.'

29, 30. This is the doctrine of Providence pushed to a terrible extreme. And yet if we once, in faith and hope, begin, where can we stop?

31. W. says that the Greek rests upon a mistranslation of an Aramaic original. It ought to be: 'Ye are of much more value than sparrows.'

32, 33. *Cp.* Mark viii. 38. As to the relation of these verses to Mark, see the notes on Mark. It does not follow, if 32, 33 come from Q, that therefore 26–31 also come from the same source, though Harnack asserts of them no less than of 32, 33 that they wear 'alle Züge ältester Ueberlieferung' (*Sprüchen und Reden,* p. 149).

32. Luke (xii. 8) has 'the Son of man will acknowledge him before the angels of God.' Here, says Harnack, Matthew is nearer to Q in keeping 'I' for the 'Son of man,' but Luke is more authentic in having 'angels of God' instead of 'my father in heaven.' The change of Matthew is 'dogmatisch-christologisch.' And so in 33. Völter (*Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu,* p. 36) takes a different view. He agrees with Harnack as to the angels of God, but thinks that the 'Son of man' in Luke is more original than the 'I' of Matthew. For, as in Mark viii. 38, Jesus means by the Son of man not himself, but the apocalyptic and heavenly Son of man of Daniel. Matthew has put the personal pronoun so as to avoid the chance that anybody should think that the Son of man and Jesus were not one and the same. See also the note on Luke xii. 9. On the other hand, Loisy thinks that the 'I' of Matthew is more original. For it is more natural that Jesus should be present at the Judgment to recognize his own disciples than a Son of man who is not Jesus. A judgment with God as judge and Jesus as witness is more natural here than a judgment by the Son of Man with the angels as assessors (*E. S.* I. p. 890).

For 34–36, *cp.* Luke xii. 51–53; Micah vii. 6. The sword does not mean war between nations, but dissension between families, of which one member remains a Jew, while the other becomes a Christian. Harnack thinks the wording of Luke xii. 51 less original than that of Matthew. Allen, as often, will not allow that one source (Q) is common to both Matthew and Luke: 'Phraseology and context alike differ. The two Evangelists draw from different sources.' So too for verse 37. In this view B. Weiss agrees with him.

The facts of history lend a terrible reality and a shocking truth to the statement of 34. Happily Jesus may, I think, be regarded as innocent of any such affirmation, though J. Weiss believes that the saying is one of the most characteristic and most authentic of the words attributed to Jesus! He realized that his message was quite opposed to that which men hear gladly, and to which they are accustomed. What he had experienced in his own family he foresaw would happen widely. The younger generation will be alienated from their parents. This view seems to me doubtful.

35. Feud between members of a family is also mentioned in the Talmud as a sign of the coming of the Messianic age. And 'social strife is a common feature of the apocalyptic description of the last days' (Allen).

For 37–39, *cp.* Luke xiv. 25–27; Mark x. 29, viii. 34, 35 and notes.

38. *Cp.* Mark viii. 34; Luke ix. 23; Matt. xvi. 24; Luke xiv. 27. Mr Allen argues for the authenticity of the saying. If Jesus looked forward to death, then 'it is historically probable' that he should 'anticipate it as one of crucifixion.' This had become, as it would seem, typical of violent death. Quotations are then given to this effect from classical and Rabbinical literature. For the other view see W.'s note on Mark viii. 34.

On 37, *cp.* viii. 22. In the last resort it is true that the Truth, the Good, the Law of God, God Himself, or however we name the Ultimate End, or Summum Bonum, must be fought for and clung to at all costs and every hazard. Its claim is final and absolute. But the situation is rare in which the service of the Highest takes an opposing form to an obedience to the letter or the spirit of the fifth Commandment. No doubt many a missionary, whose choice of life was opposed by his parents, has appealed to the authority of this verse for his adequate justification. How far he was right or wrong must, I suppose, be separately decided in each separate case. It would depend upon a number of different and delicate considerations.

39. The word 'find' gives point to the paradox. The soul is used in a double sense. On the one hand it stands for the lower sensuous life, on the other for the higher spiritual life which, at the resurrection, is the result of earthly martyrdom. ἀπολέσαι in the first clause means 'lose,' in the second 'destroy,' or 'sacrifice.' The 'finding' in the first clause is for the moment; the 'finding' in the second is for eternity. This saying and the next occur in all the four Gospels. Matthew and Luke have it twice. Once (Matt. xvi. 25 and Luke ix. 24) from Mark, while Matt. x. 39, Luke xvii. 33, come from Q. *Cp.* also John xii. 25. Matthew, but not Luke, has 'for my sake' in 39. The addition, says Harnack, is 'dogmatisch-christologisch.'

40-42. The last verses of the charge return more strictly to the mission with which the first verses started (W.). They form, as B. Weiss thinks, the true conclusion of the speech to the apostles on their mission, while 17–39, though also from Q, are an insertion from a totally different occasion and speech.

40. Here again the saying occurs twice in Matthew and twice in Luke. In Matt. xviii. 5, Luke ix. 48 (drawn from Mark ix. 37) the object received is a child. Here and Luke x. 16 the objects are the disciples. *Cp.* John xiii. 20. The 'receiving' here is not meant in any mystical sense. It means merely hospitably receive into the house, and entertain and acknowledge. But the mystical meaning is prepared for at the end. For the 'reception' of the disciple implies the reception of God. Probably Q meant by the reception of God no more than obedient hearkening to God. He did not mean the inward 'reception' of the divine Spirit within the human soul. For the question of the relation of 40–42 to Mark ix. 37, 41 *cp.* the notes on Mark.

41. 'In the name of a prophet.' This seems to mean 'in his capacity of prophet,' 'because he is a prophet,' 'for his own sake,' 'for the sake of the cause.'

δίκαιος in 41 is characteristic of Matthew. For him righteousness (*δικαιοσύνη*) is still the supreme virtue. So here *δίκαιος* is a distinctive appellation for a Christian; for the Christians, and not the Pharisees, are (to Matthew) the true fulfillers of the Law (W.). J. Weiss thinks that the *δίκαιος* is not the mere Christian. The latter is the 'little one,' first mentioned in the next verse. The 'righteous' must refer to some specially pious persons. To receive prophets or a 'righteous man in that name' means to receive them in the conviction and with the knowledge that they are unusually or specially gifted persons, and to show them the honour which is their due. See also quotation from M. Loisy on verse 42.

42. 'These little ones.' *Cp.* Mark ix. 41, 42. Here those are meant who stand on a lower level in the community than prophets and apostles. But help rendered, in the true spirit of discipleship, to the humblest Christian will not be forgotten at the day of reckoning.

'In the name of a disciple': *i.e.* in his capacity as such, because he is a disciple.

M. Loisy acutely observes: 'Matthew brings out the idea of recompense by mentioning various persons who are pleasing to God and by remarking that the merits of him who behaves towards them in a fitting manner will be equal to theirs. In respect of substance no less than of form, this assertion belongs to the Evangelist rather than to Jesus. Or, if not the creation of the Evangelist, then of tradition. For verse 41 may have been in the source (Q) without therefore on that account being an authentic saying of Jesus. The verse seems to be imitated from the preceding sentence (verse 40) and is meant to complete it; but it narrows the meaning of it considerably, and introduces, as regards the measure of the reward, a new idea, and one that is open to much argument if it is taken in its strict sense. To receive a prophet as a prophet is not the same thing as to receive an apostle in the name of Jesus, and to deserve the favour of God, because one receives a man sent by God, is not the same thing as to deserve in heaven the place of the prophet to whom one has given hospitality on earth. In speaking of prophets and righteous men, Matthew imitates the language of the Old Testament, but it must be confessed that Jesus himself could not have had such persons in view without falling into abstract theory, and that the Evangelist is not really thinking of prophets and righteous men in the old sense of the words. Matthew views the apostles as now taking the place of the old prophets; in the Christian communities he knows also of prophets and holy men who rank with the missionaries; he wished to make a place for them, and to complete his enumeration, he went to Mark for the words about the cup of cold water given "to the little ones." In this way the principal classes of Christians are represented: apostles, prophets, saints, and simple believers. He who receives a prophet because he is a prophet, a man of God, and not for reasons which have nothing to do with his character, "shall obtain the reward of a prophet," that is to say, the same reward as if he were the prophet himself. He who receives a righteous or saintly man, that is to say, one of those who follow the ideal of perfection marked out by Christ, and of which the mass of believers had from the first shown themselves incapable, shall receive the reward of a righteous man, as if he were righteous himself. The righteousness or saintliness that the Evangelist has in view is not that of the patriarchs but rather that which "exceeds the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees." In the first case, it may be said that the merit is not attached to the dignity of the function, but to the manner in which it is discharged; he who receives the prophet worthily does his duty as thoroughly as the prophet who is faithful to the spirit which enlightens him. In the second case, the honour given to the righteous man proves that one esteems the type of holiness which he represents, and that one at least desires to realize it oneself so far as is possible: to pay homage to the righteous man under such conditions is to be already righteous in intention. But the Evangelist, to encourage his readers in the duty of Christian hospitality, is not afraid of putting on the same footing as regards the reward him who receives and him who is received. In the same way, he who has offered a mere cup of cold water, a kindness specially appreciable in hot countries, to one of these "little ones," that is to say, to the simple believer, because he is a disciple of the Gospel, shall not lose his reward' (*E. S.* I. pp. 897–899).

As regards the whole section 16–42 W. remarks: 'This long appendix to the instructions for the missionary journey of the disciples has been put together by Matthew from various material. Before (1–15), the Twelve were addressed; here, it is the disciples generally. Before, they might or might not receive a friendly welcome from the house they enter; here, the enmity of the world is certain. Even before, the future was anticipated' (*i.e.* the author cannot be Jesus), 'but here, far more clearly, the beginnings of the End are at hand. The true background is easily recognized: it is, as in the Sermon on the Mount, the period of the persecution of the Palestinian Christian community, which was naturally mainly directed against its leaders and apostles. The disciples will receive no better fate than the Master; for them, too, martyrdom is imminent. When they are brought before the authorities, they are to speak out and say what the Spirit suggests to them. Yet, when persecuted in one city, they may flee to another; they are not to provoke danger, but they are to be clever as serpents: if they can escape, so much the better. The spirit of the first disciples, which meets us here, has nothing fantastic or feverish about it. It is not stubborn or fanatical, but depressed and yet resigned. In comparison with Daniel, where the situation is much the same, the expectation of the speedy End (Parousia) falls into the background. Elsewhere, too, Matthew restrains it, and Jesus only speaks of it shortly before his death. The Parousia in the Gospels generally serves rather as spur than as comfort.' For my own part I am disposed to agree with W. The tendency of criticism at present is to be very tender towards the authenticity of the words put into the mouth of Jesus. Harnack seems to be growing more and more conservative in this respect. But in his *general* conclusions on this subject W. seems to me to have the truer insight and *flair*. It is his views which will, I think, here stand better the severe test of time.

xi. 1. This verse corresponds with Mark vi. 12, Luke ix. 6.

CHAPTER XI

2–6. JOHN THE BAPTIST'S ENQUIRIES

(*Cp.* Luke vii. 18–23)

2 Now when John heard in the prison the works of the Christ,
3 he sent a message through his disciples, and said unto him, 'Art
4 thou he who is to come, or are we to wait for another?' Jesus
answered and said unto them, 'Go and report to John what ye
5 hear and see: the blind see again, and the lame walk; the lepers
are cleansed, and the deaf hear; the dead are raised up, and the
6 poor receive the Good Tidings. And happy is he, who findeth no
stumbling-block in me.'

In Mark the mission of the apostles is followed by a section about John the Baptist. The same is the case in Matthew, only the matter is different. Mark's story does not come in Matthew till xiv. In this place Matthew introduces passages about John taken from Q. 'On doit noter que la série des miracles précédemment racontés a été arrangée de façon à justifier la response que Jésus fait aux messagers du Baptiste' (*E. S.* I. p. 127).

2. John, so some commentators assume, had believed that Jesus was the Messiah, but had now begun to doubt, because Jesus did not do the things, or make the claims, which John, on the ordinary old Jewish lines, expected from the Messiah. Holtzmann, however, urges that this view mainly depends upon Matt. iii. 14, 15 being regarded as historical, which it surely is not. He therefore prefers to think that John had not once fully believed and then doubted, but that he had all along hesitated, half believed and half disbelieved, and remained uncertain. Loisy still more strongly maintains that iii. 14, 15 is not historical. John's present enquiry is not due to doubt supervening upon faith, but is 'le premier soupçon qui s'éveille dans son esprit touchant

le grand rôle qui pourrait appartenir au prédicateur de Nazareth' (*E. S.* I. p. 660).

τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 'the works of the Messiah.' The strange wording may be intentional here, as the question is whether Jesus is the Messiah or no. But the MS. D reads, 'the works of Jesus.'

5. Matthew and Luke both hold that Jesus makes appeal to real miracles. Some commentators think they are right. 'John's messengers had not seen and heard Jesus healing the spiritually blind and the morally leprous. What need, moreover, to add "the poor have Good Tidings preached to them," if all which precedes refers to the preaching of the Good Tidings? It is unnatural to express the same fact first by a series of metaphors, and then literally' (Plummer). So too Harnack (*Sprüche und Reden*, pp. 150, 151), and Oort. Others, including M. Loisy and W., suppose that the blind who have been made to see, the dead who have been made to live again, are metaphors for the spiritual activity and wonders which Jesus displayed and wrought. What John's messengers heard and saw was not a series of miracles, but how Jesus taught and the effects of his teaching. 'The purely moral character of the Gospel being precisely what troubled John, it is not surprising that Jesus offers it to him as a mark of its truth' (*E. S.* I. p. 665). 'That Jesus, at any moment of his ministry whatever, publicly made capital out of his miracles, and that he alleged as evidence of his mission the great number of blind men whose sight he had restored, the lepers he had healed, the dead he had raised up, is as repugnant to his general attitude and to his character as to the actual facts. The attitude of the Evangelists towards the assertion relating to the dead who had been raised throws a special light upon the state of the historical tradition. Matthew contented himself with the case narrated in Mark; Luke, supposing that this story was subsequent to the Baptist's message, looked for another, and appears to have had some difficulty in discovering one. The cases of restoration of sight had not been very numerous either. It is inconceivable that Jesus can have spoken of exceptional cases as if they were the ordinary manifestations of his activity. As he had himself no disposition to work miracles, he cannot have paraded them by putting them forward as Messianic acts and as evident manifestations of the reign of God, much less can he have exaggerated them' (*ib.* p. 663). The main point would then lie in the last clause: 'the poor have Good Tidings preached to them.' The metaphors would then follow those in Isaiah xxxv. 5, xlii. 7, lxi. 1. In any case Isaiah lxi. 1 is the original for the 'Good Tidings.' The Septuagint version uses the very words.

The question presents itself whether Jesus interpreted Isaiah lxi. 1 and similar passages as prophecies, and really believed that they referred to him and that he fulfilled them, or whether it was his disciples who, after his death, first made this identification. In the latter case Jesus could not himself have uttered the words of Matthew xi. 4–6. The chapter has undoubtedly a good deal of later material, but it does not therefore follow that Jesus did not believe that he was the fulfiller of the prophetic utterances. That Jesus did not give a more direct reply may be due, as M. Loisy thinks, to his unwillingness at that time openly to declare himself the Messiah. J. Weiss points out that even if the reply of Jesus is not authentic, it is rightly characteristic that no direct 'Yes, I am the Messiah' is put into his mouth. The great deeds of mercy (to him sheer miracles) which ('probably to his own amazement') he accomplished, made him convinced that the rule of Satan was being broken, the Kingdom of God beginning. On this he laid stress; of this he felt convinced. Of his own Messiahship (and of the sense in which he was Messiah) he spoke and felt less clearly.

6. If you do not recognize the new light, but deny its truth and validity, you are clearly twice as much in the dark as you were before the light arose. Hence every new truth is salvation to those who can receive it; to those who misunderstand or refuse to believe, it is a snare and a danger. Their latter state is worse than their first. There is psychological verity in this.

7–19. THE BAPTIST AND THE SON OF MAN

(*Cp.* Luke vii. 24–28, 31–35, xvi. 16)

7 And as they departed, Jesus began to say unto the people
concerning John: 'Why went ye out into the wilderness? To see
8 a reed shaken with the wind? Or why went ye out? To see
a man clothed in soft raiment? behold, they that wear soft
9 clothing are in the houses of kings. Or why went ye out? To see
10 a prophet? yea, I say unto you, and more than a prophet. For
this is he, of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger
11 before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee. Verily
I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath
not arisen a greater than John the Baptist: yet he that is least in
the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.

12 'But from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom
of heaven is being stormed, and the stormers seize it by force.

13, 14 For all the Prophets and the Law prophesied until John. And if
15 ye are willing to receive it: this is Elijah who was to come. He
that hath ears, let him hear.

16 'But to whom shall I liken this generation? It is like unto
children sitting in the market-places who call to their companions,
17 and say, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we
18 have made lamentation, and ye have not beaten the breast. For
John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He has a
19 demon. The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say,
Behold a glutton and a wine-bibber, a friend of tax-collectors and
sinners. But wisdom was justified by her works.'

It is quite possible, as W. says, that there is no real connection between 7–14 and 2–6. This is also the view of M. Loisy. He holds that the basis of 7–10 was probably earlier than the occasion of 2–6, while 11–14 is probably later than either. The redactional transition 'when they were gone' has no historic foundation (*E. S.* I. p. 667). 7–10 was said in the early period of the Galilæan ministry and while John was in prison, while 11–14 was more probably drawn up after his death.

The translation of 7–9 is uncertain; so is the punctuation. *τί*, W. contends, must be throughout either 'why' or 'what': he renders 'why?' 'for what purpose?' Loisy and Harnack render 'what,' 'what did ye go out to see?'

John is recognized by Jesus to be an exceptional personality, a stern, austere and unbending man, a prophet, and more than a prophet, because he is the forerunner of the Messiah.

Yet he still stands in the old order, and belongs to the old era. Therefore the least in the new era is greater than he. And this new era has begun. The Kingdom of God has begun with the advent of the Messiah, and the first members of the Kingdom are the first believers in his person and words. The meanest Christian is, as a Christian, more than the greatest Jew. Whether Jesus uttered the words, whether they represent his thought, is not wholly certain. But the question whether he did or did not do so has for us to-day no religious value, and only exegetical and historical interest. All that is of religious value and interest to us is the religious truth which we can find in Jesus's teaching. Any exaggerated views which he held as to his own person, or any mistaken exegetical interpretations of ancient prophecies, do not greatly concern us. Much of his moral and religious teaching is independent of the question whether he believed, or did not believe, that he was the Messiah—whether he believed, or did not believe, that with him a new religious era had begun.

We know that his exegesis was necessarily imperfect, that his expectations of a new world and of a speedy and final Judgment were both mistaken. We shall not believe in him the more, in any specifically 'Christian' sense, because he so believed in himself, but, on the other hand, we shall not, even if he did so believe, refuse to recognize the sublime and original elements of his teaching and its value in the history of religion, for Judaism and for ourselves. In one important sense Jesus was the founder of a new era, though not as he meant or anticipated. Christianity does mark a new era in religious history and in human civilization. What the world owes to Jesus and to Paul is immense; things can never be, and men can never think, the same as things were, and as men thought, before those two great men lived. The future will do justice *both* to the protest of the Jew *and* to the new outlook upon religion and life which Jesus introduced into the world. For, on the one hand, thought and criticism are alike tending to the recognition of the fundamental Jewish doctrine, which Jesus, like every other Jew, believed in and taught. God is One, and no man is God. What the Jews have died in thousands to protest against was not the teaching of Jesus, but the teaching of the Church—the incarnation, the Trinity, the worship of the Man-God, the mediation of the Messiah, the worship of the virgin, the doctrine of transubstantiation, and so on. And when the liberal Protestant German theologians of to-day, who are practically Unitarians, though they do not call themselves by that name, write about Rabbinism and Judaism with disdain and disapproval, they forget that what they directly depreciate and contemn, they indirectly justify and exalt. They abandon, as not originally or specifically Christian, all those doctrines against which, from the very birth of Christianity, the Jews rebelled and protested. *They have come round to us*; for surely, as regards their conception of God and His relation to the world, the orthodox Christian of every age would dub them Judaizers and heretics. If *their* conceptions of Christianity conquer and prevail, great is the victory of Judaism. The name matters nothing: the reality, the doctrine, is all.

Nevertheless, Jesus marks an era. It is true that much is associated with his name which need not be associated with it. To us, when we open the New Testament and read the parable of the prodigal son, there is no novelty in it. To us, too, God is the loving Father who yearns to forgive the penitent. If anyone can read the Rabbinic teachings on repentance and deny that this is so, he must be case-hardened in prejudice. Moreover, we all know what we ourselves were taught. We were taught this doctrine, and we were not taught it from the New Testament or in connection with the name of Jesus. But, for all that, Jesus marks an era. I cannot conceive that a time will come when the figure of Jesus will no longer be a star of the first magnitude in the spiritual heavens, when he will no longer be regarded as one of the greatest religious heroes and teachers whom the world has seen. I cannot conceive that a time will come when 'the Bible' in the eyes of Europe will no longer be composed of the Old Testament and the New, but of the Old Testament only, or when the Gospels will be less prized than the Pentateuch, or the Books of Chronicles preferred to the Epistles of Paul. The religion of the future will be, as I believe, a developed and purified Judaism, but from that developed and purified Judaism the records which tell, however imperfectly, of perhaps its greatest, as certainly of its most potent and influential teacher, will not be excluded. The roll-call of its heroes will not omit the name of Jesus. Christianity and Judaism must gradually approach each other. The one must shed the teachings which Jesus did not teach, the other must acknowledge more fully, more frankly, than has yet been done, what he did and was for religion and for the world.

7. Jesus here gives his own testimony and opinion about John. Jesus eulogises John up to a point. John was no reed shaken with the wind, but a man of resolution, firmness, and will. The people had not flocked to see a weakling, and it was not a weakling whom they found. 7–11 J. Weiss considers authentic. Their original, uninventable phraseology speaks for authenticity. The verses perhaps imply that the people had begun to be disappointed in John. But Jesus maintains that their original enthusiasm was justified. They had seen in him a prophet, and a prophet he undoubtedly was.

8. Nor was John a courtier: he was no man of ease, but a stern and uncompromising ascetic.

9. The usual punctuation and translation are: 'But wherefore went ye out? to see a prophet?' So Revised Version. Or we can follow the reading of the MS. D, and translate: 'But what went ye out to see? A prophet?' (*i.e.* to see a prophet?).

10. Moreover John is no ordinary prophet; rather is he the prophet and messenger predicted by Malachi iii. 1 and iv. 5.

The quotation has: 'Behold, I send my messenger before *thy* face, who shall prepare *thy* way before *thee*.' The original is, 'Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare *the* way before *me*.' The origin and cause of the change are explained in Carpenter's *First Three Gospels*, p. 44.

Loisy points out that though the whole quotation may be due to tradition and not to Jesus, it may also be that Jesus quoted the passage accurately, and that it was only misquoted afterwards. For the misquotation applies to Jesus what was said of God. And in reality John was the messenger of the Kingdom and of God rather than of the Messiah. 'En citant le texte dans sa teneur véritable, Jésus confirmait ce que Jean avait dit de sa propre mission; mais il n'a pas présenté Jean comme ayant tenu vis-à-vis de lui le rôle de précurseur, puisqu'il se serait ainsi désigné lui-même en public, très expressément, comme le Messie, et que l'attitude de Jean ne justifiait pas cette assertion' (*E. S.* I. p. 668).

11–14 is again independent of 7–10. It judges and deals with John from a rather different point of view, and perhaps somewhat less favourably. It is noticeable that 7–10 ends with the reference to Elijah (as John), and 11–14 does the same.

11. Loisy well points out that the distinction made between John and the 'least in the Kingdom' is a mark of early date. 'Whoever had received the word, all the poor who had believed the good news, candidates for the Kingdom and members of it already, although not so great as John in personal worth and action, were greater than John through the relation which united them to God. Since John had not adhered to the Gospel as they had, with a simple and entire faith, and had not recognized in it the beginning of the heavenly Kingdom, he might be the greatest of men, and even the man who more than any other had contributed to prepare the way of God; but remaining outside the Kingdom, he is nothing in the Kingdom. Such a statement deals a striking blow at the harmony which tradition has attempted to establish between the preaching of John and that of Jesus; but it serves to throw light on the historical relation of the two, showing at the same time the deep impression which John had in his day made on the Saviour and his disciples, and the mutual independence of Jesus and the Baptist as regards their respective ministries' (*E. S.* I. p. 670).

John is the greatest prophet of the old order, but the preeminence of the new order and era over the old is so tremendous that the least in the new is greater than the greatest of the old. J. Weiss thinks that this is not the original meaning. Jesus did not mean that John was to be for ever excluded from, and outside of, the future Kingdom. He meant 'he who is *smaller* is *in the Kingdom* greater than he.' John will be included in the Kingdom, but he does not in the Kingdom take a high place. The measure of greatness is there different. Jesus missed in John 'die Gesinnung dienender Liebe und kindlicher Gottergebenheit.' This seems doubtful. The meaning which Weiss rejects, and the meaning which he advocates, both make the Kingdom future. This is not necessary. If the verse is *not* authentic, the Kingdom can be Matthew's usual Kingdom—*i.e.* the Kingdom as already present and realized, if imperfectly, in the Christian community, the 'Church.' But this view is strongly denied by Harnack. The Kingdom *is* here regarded as present, but it is not the Church in the sense that the words, or the passage in which they occur, could not have been said by Jesus. The new period which was begun by the activity of Jesus is the period of the Kingdom. In that sense the Kingdom is present: 'mit "Kirche" hat das nichts zu tun. Wer aber die Antinomie, "das Reich ist zukünftig und ist gegenwärtig," unerträglich findet, mit dem ist nicht zu streiten.' Mr Allen, on the contrary, says that the Kingdom of heaven, here as hitherto in this Gospel, is the Kingdom 'to be inaugurated when the Son of man comes. The least in that Kingdom will be more privileged than if he had been its herald.' Harnack's view seems more probable. But *cp.* also the notes on the parallel passage in Luke vii. 28. The veteran Dutch scholar H. Oort has written a most interesting and valuable article on Matt. xi. (Mattheüs x. en de Johannes-gemeenten) in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift* for July, 1908. It is sceptical and will probably be neglected on that account by the prevailing critics in Germany, but it is nevertheless of great suggestiveness. He points out at length the many unlikelihoods as to the words attributed to Jesus in this passage ever having been spoken by him. On the other hand, he shows how well they fit in with the Christian point of view a generation or so after the death of Jesus. However good John may have been, however important his *rôle*, he did not believe in Jesus as the Messiah, and therefore was not one of the Kingdom. For already, alas, the Kingdom was painfully circumscribed: its members were Christians and Christians only: there was no salvation for those who did not believe in the Messianic claims of Jesus.

Oort gives a very suggestive explanation of the different attitudes towards John which may be detected in the various allusions to him in the N.T., and discusses the obscure and important section in Acts xviii. 14–xix. 7.

12 is very hard. *Cp.* Luke xvi. 16. Whether the 'taking by force' is said in a good sense or a bad is disputed. In any case, W. remarks, the days of John are already past, whereas Jesus hardly outlived John. This verse, therefore (as well, probably, as

much else in this chapter), was written some time after the death of Jesus.

The more obvious view would be that 'taking by force' and 'is stormed by violence' are used in a bad sense. Jesus would then mean that since John's day rash movements have begun, rash attempts have been made, to hasten the coming of the Kingdom, to force God's hand. He may refer to the zealots and fanatics. Jesus is opposed to all force, to all political revolution. The Kingdom will come when God wills (and that is soon), but by His divine agency only. J. Weiss defends this interpretation energetically. The difficulty is that the verbs *βιάζεται* and *ἁρπάζουσιν* must be taken *de conatu.* They would mean, attempts have been made to force the coming of the Kingdom, or to acquire it by force. Of course, these attempts were unsuccessful. But can all that be included in the simple present?

M. Loisy does not regard it as impossible that 12 in a shorter form should have been spoken by Jesus. As to its meaning, his own view is that, 'the most natural sense of the words is perhaps that the Kingdom suffers violence from enemies who do not think of gaining any benefit from it, and who steal it away (*qui le dérobent*), not in order to get advantage from it, but in so far as they prevent believers from seeing the full realization of it.' Is it unlikely, he asks, 'that Jesus explained the precarious condition of the Kingdom in the present, and the delay in its manifestation, by the kind of constraint which the external world, public force, constituted authorities, by the mere fact of their existence, were not failing to exercise on the Gospel movement? May he not have said that the powerful of this world were stealing the Kingdom from the believers, because they were for the time being putting an obstacle in the way of the coming of the reign of righteousness?' (*E. S.* I. p. 672).

But this view seems very strained and unlikely, and M. Loisy acknowledges: 'It would be better still to put oneself at the point of view of the first Christians arguing against the Jews, and especially against the followers of John, and declaring that the Kingdom had come with the Christ, but that it was hindered, like the glorious manifestation of the Saviour himself, by the malice of men.' If these interpretations be rejected, M. Loisy thinks the sentence had better be brought into connection with the parable of the two sons (xxi. 28–31) and its application (xxi. 31, 32), and be explained as meaning: 'the Kingdom suffers violence, because it is not those who seemed to have a right to it and to be waiting for it who were taking possession of it; it was chance victors (*conquérants d'aventure*) who were seizing it, tax-gathers and sinners, who appeared to be stealing what belonged to others; thus the Kingdom was, as it were, given over to pillage' (*E. S.* I. pp. 672, 673). [In this case the violence and stealing are ironical. For the sinners were quite right to steal what they stole: the pillage is a good and righteous pillage.]

Mr Allen's view is quite different. He agrees with Dalman. The Kingdom is violently treated in the persons of its messengers and heralds. 'The editor has in mind the death of the Baptist and the similar ill-treatment meted out to subsequent Christian teachers. So far the words might be taken as a simple editorial comment parallel to the editorial comment at this place in Luke. But just as Luke vii. 29, 30 are so worded that they might appear a continuation of Christ's words, so Matt. xi. 12 suggests the question, Is this a simple comment of the editor reflecting on the fact that John was the first of a long line of men who suffered on behalf of the Kingdom, or did he intend the verse to be taken as a continuation of Christ's words? The parallel in Luke xvi. 16 seems to prove that Matthew was acquainted with a traditional saying of Christ which brought into clear connection the Kingdom and the verb *βιάζεσθαι* ("to be treated violently"). That is to say, in his comment in 12 he is paraphrasing words traditionally ascribed to Christ, and he probably intended the verse to be taken as spoken by Christ in continuation of 11 in spite of the fact that the phrase "from the days of John the Baptist" clearly betrays either Christ speaking on another occasion than that described in 2–6, or the Evangelist himself. It seems probable that he knew of a saying ascribed to Christ which described the Kingdom, since John preached, as in some sense the object of men's violence. He therefore inserted it here, together with 14 and 15, as affording a connecting link between 7–11 and 16–19, and with the intention of preparing for the latter paragraph in which John's career is viewed as finally closed.' This is a possible mediatizing view, but hardly a very probable one. Some commentators, on the other hand, think the verbs must be used in a good sense, and if so, we had best explain the verse to refer to those who 'in ernste Anstrengung der Busse sich darum bemühen, wohl auch zu energischem Zugreifen, unter Umständen zu Gewaltthaten von der Art der v. 29, 30, vi. 24, x. 37–39, xviii. 8, 9 geschilderten sich aufraffen, oder in kühnem Glauben die Vollendung der nur geringen und verborgenen Anfänge vorwegnehmen' (Holtzmann). This view has also difficulties of its own, and the verse is more than ever likely, on this interpretation, to be later than Jesus.

13. Mr Allen says: 'Verse 13 seems to be brought in here only on the ground that it contains the name John. It seems impossible to find any good connection with 12.' W. says that it

would be better to place it, as in Luke, before 12. The meaning may be that the Prophets and the Law point forward to the period which began with John (*i.e.* the Messianic age). So Weiss, who for the predictions of the Law refers to Deut. xviii. 15, 19. Or we may say that the Law and the Prophets are regarded as a whole. The period of the 'Old Testament' was one of preparation and foretelling. It has now come to its predestined and predicted close. The words in Luke xvi. 16 seem more clear, but they are not necessarily therefore more original. Harnack holds that in 12 and 13, as in the whole passage from 3, Matthew has preserved the more original form of the source Q. These two verses were as hard to him as to us. Luke has: 'The Law and the Prophets were until John: from that time the Gospel of the Kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it' (R.V.).

Merx has a curious interpretation of 12 and 13. He holds that Jesus did not regard himself as the Jewish Messiah. He was something more and greater. He was the predicted founder of the Kingdom of heaven. As Elijah was predicted to precede the Jewish Messiah, so John preceded the founder of the new Kingdom. The Kingdom would be more rapidly developed, were it not for Jewish opposition. This is what *βιάζεται* and *ἁρπάζουσιν* mean. The Kingdom is kept away from those to whom it should belong: it is robbed from them. In 13 S.S. has only Prophets, without Law. This is correct, says Merx. The meaning is: with John the era of prediction is over. With Jesus begins the fulfilment.

As to this view, and Merx's statement: 'Jesus war dem Judentum entwachsen,' the difficulty is that in that case Jesus's attitude towards the prophets becomes a greater puzzle than ever. Where do the prophets foretell a founder of the Kingdom of heaven who was not the Jewish Messiah? If the prophets were true prophets in the eyes of Jesus, how could he not have believed in the truth of Isaiah xi.? If they were false prophets, why does he appeal to them?

16–19. Again a separate little piece, the date and origin of which remain uncertain. The source is still Q.

16. There are two possible interpretations. (1) The 'generation' is *not* like the children. It is like their 'fellows,' like them who would neither dance nor mourn. This generation, Jesus's contemporaries, understands the meaning neither of John's solemn warnings nor of Jesus's joyous tidings.

Or (2) the generation *is* like the children. When John came with his asceticism, they complained that he would not be merry ('he had a demon'); when Jesus came with his cheerfulness, they said he was a winebibber.

M. Loisy would try to keep 16–19 for Jesus by assigning it to a late period in his life, when it was evident that the religious chiefs of the Jews, and the mass who docilely followed them, would not attach themselves to the teaching of Jesus any more than they had attached themselves to the teaching of John. M. Loisy holds that the children and the companions are not to be separated in the application of the parable. They jointly represent the Jews who are satisfied neither with the asceticism of John nor with the less austere life of Jesus.

W. notes that the tenses in 18 and 19 are the same. If John belongs to the past, then also Jesus. But Harnack strongly denies the validity of such deduction. If Jesus had already a good bit of his ministry behind him, why should he not have used this tense? Harnack is keen for the authenticity of 2–11 and 16–19 (from his beloved Q). He makes a good point when he says that the words in 19 of the Son of man who ate and drank do not show 'das Walten nachträglicher Legende.' On the other side one should read Oort, who has a good theory why 19 might have been said of Jesus many years after his death. And could Jesus really even late in his career have had to complain of *popular* dislike and neglect? There is little or no trace of it. John again was, so far as we know, much honoured by the populace. We do not hear that he was supposed to be possessed. In Jesus's mouth these words, says Oort, are not free from 'overdrijving en onbillijkheid' (*Theol. Tijd.* p. 321).

19. The best reading in Matthew is ἔργων. 'But wisdom was (or is) justified by her *works*'—*i.e.* by its results. 'The words, as we find them in the Greek, can only be understood as a judgment of the later Christian community. In contrast to the doubts of the many, wisdom, incorporated in Jesus, has nevertheless been acknowledged and proved by its works—the works of the Messiah. The conception of wisdom made incarnate in Jesus is peculiar. It is a bit of old speculative Christology' (J. Weiss). Luke and the S.S. in Matthew, followed and defended by Loisy, read *τέκνων, sons* or *children*—*i.e.* either (1) those who have accepted John and Jesus, and believed in them; or (2) wisdom is the divine wisdom, and her children are the Jews. So they are called (viii. 12) children of the Kingdom; that is their claim; it is in a sense their birthright, but they have forfeited their right, and their sonship has been taken from them. The divine wisdom, represented both by John and Jesus, is justified before or over against the Jews, for their arguments against Jesus and John are nullified by their self-contradiction. The first interpretation (of 'children'), which seems more probable, is that of Weiss, Adeney, Loisy, and many

others; the second is Harnack's and also W.'s. It may well be that Luke's *τέκνων* ('children') was the original reading in Q. So both B. and J. Weiss. Indeed W. refuses to allow that *ἔργων* makes any tolerable sense. 'Die Lesung *ἔργα* für *τέκνα*,' he says in his energetic way, 'taugt nichts; was sie bedeuten soll, darüber wird mehr geredet als gesagt. Wie sie entstanden ist, lässt sich bis jetzt auch nicht ausmachen.' W.'s remarks upon the whole section are worth transcribing:

'John was the predecessor of Jesus; and as regards baptism, fasting and prayer, his disciples had a priority over the disciples of Jesus. They did not join the disciples of Jesus, but maintained the independence of their master, and with that, naturally, also his superiority over Jesus. The Christians, on the other hand, maintained that John had only been the forerunner of Jesus, and had not wished to be anything else; he had recognized Jesus to be the Messiah. In Matt. xi. this much, however, is conceded, that, after his acknowledgment of Jesus, he became doubtful, because he did not recognize in what Jesus did the realization of his conception of the Messiah. The special gifts of John are appreciated in our chapter, but stress is also laid upon what he lacked. And that was that he did not enter the Kingdom; *i.e.* that he did not become a disciple of Jesus. The sharp difference which is made between the old and the new era is remarkable (7–15). Christianity is severed from Judaism. And yet, as opposed to the Jews, John and Jesus are reckoned together (16–19).'

20–24. THE GALILÆAN CITIES ARE CONDEMNED

(*Cp.* Luke x. 13–16)

20 Then began he to reproach the cities wherein most of his
mighty works had been done, because they had not repented.
21 'Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the
mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre
and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and
22 ashes. But I say unto you, It shall be more endurable for Tyre
23 and Sidon at the Day of Judgment than for you. And thou,
Capernaum, which wast exalted unto heaven, shalt be thrust
down unto Hades: for if the mighty works, which have been
done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained
24 until this day. But I say unto you, That it shall be more endurable for the land of Sodom in the Day of Judgment, than for
thee.'

This section has no obvious connection with what has preceded; in Luke the verses form part of the discourse to the Seventy. The words seem only suitable if Jesus spoke them at the close of his ministry. In Mark, moreover, though Jesus fails at Nazareth, he has his best successes at Capernaum. Perhaps, as W. suggests, Christianity went back in Capernaum during the apostolic period; Peter and the disciples moved from there to Jerusalem. But Loisy defends the authenticity: 'Rien dans leur sens primitif et naturel n'invite à en suspecter l'authenticité' (*E. S.* I. p. 879). B. Weiss essays to prove without question that the section stood in Q in the 'Aussendungsrede,' the speech to the disciples on their being sent upon their preaching mission. It should follow x. 15 (*Quellen*, A, p. 68, B, p. 28). Loisy, on the other hand, says: 'ce morceau n'appartenait certainement pas au discours de mission, et il a chance d'avoir été dit à une époque plus récente, mais il avait été rattaché au discours dans la source commune de Matthieu et de Luc à raison de l'analogie qu'il présente, soit pour le fond, soit pour la forme, avec ce que Jésus disait du sort réservé aux villes qui ne recevraient pas le message des apôtres' (*E. S.* I. p. 876). Thus once more do the great authorities differ.

20. One wonders what is meant by repentance here. If Jesus attached a great or growing importance to a belief in himself, it is quite conceivable and psychologically explicable that he confused a disbelief in himself with moral deadness or sinfulness. Yet a Jew was justified in disbelieving in Jesus if he claimed to be the Messiah. There was (at least till his death) nothing to identify Jesus with the suffering servant of Isaiah liii. And even if Jesus claimed to be the servant (which is doubtful), and even if the suffering servant of Isaiah xlii. and liii. was interpreted by some to mean the Messiah, the prevailing view of the Messiah was that of Isaiah xi. The righteous conquering prince is the usual conception of him; the suffering servant is the exception. Hence to most Jews a belief in Jesus's personal claims was impossible; for if the general argument of the prophets was true, Jesus was not the Messiah, and the Messianic age had not begun. On the other hand, Jesus did not say that the prevailing passages in the prophets were wrong, or deceptive, or merely preparatory, or only true up to a point, or outward, or symbolical, or typical; and if he had said so, nobody would have believed him.

21. The miracles are regarded as the reason why Jesus should have found faith. Yet elsewhere the Jews are rebuked for asking for a sign. Whether they refused to believe in his miracles, or asked for a special miracle, his opponents were always in the wrong. That is only human nature.

23. Revised Version and many commentators read and render, 'And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven?' An easier reading is, 'which wast exalted unto heaven' (by the honour of being the scene and centre of Jesus's ministry). If this second reading is accurate, Oort is right in saying that such a sentence in Jesus's mouth partakes of 'zelfverheffing.' And here again it may be asked: is there evidence that the Galilæan cities showed him so little faith? The violent exclamation is not in keeping with the boasted gentleness of verse 29. But the exaggerated tone is pardonable in a Christian of later years who, astonished at the scepticism shown by Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum towards the Gospel, calls out angrily: How is this scepticism possible in cities in which Jesus performed his miracles, and above all in the very city where he lived? To hell with such hardened souls! (*Theol. Tijd.* p. 326).

25–30. Jesus and his Mission

(*a*) The Father and the Son (25–27)

(*Cp.* Luke x. 21, 22)

25 At that time Jesus answered and said, 'I praise thee, O Father,
Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from
the wise and the clever, and hast revealed them unto the simple.
6, 27 Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight. All was
delivered unto me by my Father: and no man knoweth the Son
except the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father except
the Son, and he to whom the Son would reveal him.

The passage consists of two sections, 25–27 and 28–30. It must have already in Q followed the condemnation of the Galilæan cities, for in Luke also the one follows (with the short interruption of x. 16–20) upon the other. Loisy observes that, to Matthew, the condemnation implied and presaged the lot of all those who should reject the Gospel, while 25–30 foreshadowed in the Galilæan converts the character and the privileges of all believers. Q probably indicated the occasion on which the words were said, namely, the return of the Twelve (*cp.* Luke x. 17 and B. Weiss, *Quellen*, B, p. 30). Matthew says nothing about their departure or their return. In giving the verses 20–24 and 25–30 without their occasion or connection, he may have wanted to enlarge the perspective. 'Following, as now they do, a sharp condemnation upon the attitude of the Jews towards the Saviour (xi. 19), these passages symbolize, much more definitely than they did in Q, the reprobation of unbelieving Judaism and the happy election of the Christian community' (*E. S.* I. p. 906).

The first section (25–27) of the passage (25–30) would be, if an authentic utterance, of the greatest importance in determining what Jesus supposed to be his special relation to God.

25. *ἐξομολογοῦμαι.* Usually the word means 'confess': here it seems to mean 'praise' or 'thank.' But in that case for what precisely does Jesus thank God? Is he not only glad that God has revealed the truth about himself to the simple, but that he has *not* revealed it to the wise and the clever? Woe to the unbelieving Scribes, and yet thank God for their unbelief! It is not pleasing to have to believe that Jesus said this, or that he was filled by this reflection with holy joy (Luke x. 21). Oort insists, but I think wrongly, that *ἐξομολογοῦμαι* must mean 'I recognize,' 'I acknowledge,' and holds that the fact could not have been a cause for joy. It could only have prompted 'calm resignation,' a quiet acknowledgment of a painful truth. But this seems off the line.

ταῦτα. What is 'this,' or 'these things'? It must be the Gospel generally; the teaching of Jesus about the Kingdom, its conditions and its near commencement. Or, perhaps the truth about Jesus himself, his Messiahship and all that it implies. In view of what follows this is not unlikely. The official teachers of Judaism, the wise Rabbis and learned Pharisees, have rejected the Gospel and closed their ears; but the simple, the childlike, the uneducated, have welcomed the truth and understood. To them, not to the learned, it has been revealed; the eyes of their hearts were open, and they felt and saw. The words and thoughts are curiously parallel, as Pfleiderer has pointed out, to those of Paul in I Cor. i. 19–25, and from there till the end of chapter ii. (*Urchristentum,* Vol. I. p. 435).

26. The simplest translation seems to be: 'Yes, Father, [I praise thee] that such was thy pleasure.' Jesus rejoices over the result of his teaching. He is glad that just the poor and simple have understood him, and that it is *their* hearts which have been turned towards God.

M. Loisy observes that, though the sentiment is not foreign to the spirit of Jesus, yet 'le fond même du discours et la construction rhythmique du passage inviteraient plutôt à y voir l'œuvre d'un prophète chrétien, parlant au nom du Christ, dans le style des psaumes et des prophètes de l'Ancien Testament' (*E. S.* I. p. 907).

27. There is an abrupt transition to another theme. Nevertheless it would seem as if 27 were written to accompany or follow on 26. M. Loisy aptly says: 'What follows is in another tone and refers to another object. It is anything but a prayer. It seems rather to be an indirect defence of the faith which the simple have shown in the preaching of the Gospel, a recommendation of the Christ himself who defines himself before his disciples in order to enhance his authority, a theory of the Christian revelation, which is also a Christology. Without any transition, the Christ who was speaking to his Father, now speaks of himself. The seeming unity of the discourse is the result of the fact that it is meant as a doxology throughout, and the rhythm of this verse is that of the preceding passage, but the connection of the personal doxology with the divine doxology is more intelligible from the point of view of the Evangelists than from the point of view of Jesus. It is implied that if the humble believers are learned in divine things, it is because Jesus has taught them those things, and Jesus has been able to teach them with certainty because he obtains his knowledge from the heavenly Father' (*E. S.* I. 908).

'All.' What 'all'? Apparently the meaning is all true religion, all the true knowledge and teaching about the Kingdom and the conditions of entering it, and how the new era had begun, and the Judgment was at hand. The *πάντα* refers back to the *ταῦτα* of 25.

All this knowledge has been entrusted, or delivered, by God to Jesus, and to Jesus only. Thus no one knows the true purposes of God except Jesus, and those to whom Jesus may explain them. 'The Father' and 'the Son' are only used in this special sense in a late chapter of Mark (xiii. 32), and then in the fourth Gospel. W. holds that the words 'and no man knoweth the Son except the Father' are an old interpolation. They certainly do not seem here, except as a corollary, particularly in place. But M. Loisy says: 'Les deux propositions concernant le Père et le Fils font jeu de mots et ne sont pas à expliquer indépendamment l'une de l'autre: elles expriment la réciprocité de connaissance parfaite, et rien de plus. En supprimant la première, on détruit l'économie de la strophe' (*E. S.* I. p. 908, n. 4).

It seems hard to believe that Jesus uttered these words. There is no sure parallel for his speaking of himself as '*the* Son' in a special sense. The exclusiveness of the saying that 'no one knows the Father except the Son' is painful; one can only hope that Jesus never uttered it. The verses in question are lucidly treated of by Loisy in his famous book *L'Évangile et l'Église.* If W.'s view that the passage did not originally include the words 'and no man knoweth the Son except the Father' be not accepted, then there is much force in Loisy's argument that the words must refer to the transcendental relations existing between Father and Son. The Son is not the Son merely because he knows the Father, or knows God as Father, in a special, new, and intimate sense (this is Harnack's view), for the words 'no man knoweth the Son except the Father' are then left unexplained. 'Father and Son are here already metaphysical concepts. There is only one Father and only one Son, who are, in some sort, constituted by the knowledge they have of one another. The intention of the passage is not so much to explain how Jesus is the Son of God as to exalt the person of the Christ in identifying him with the Eternal Wisdom, which God alone knows fully (although it reveals itself to men), and which alone possesses and represents the complete knowledge of God, though it reveals that knowledge to man' (*L'Évangile et l'Église*, pp. 78, 79, 3rd ed.).

Many critics have pointed out the curious relation of the passage to Ecclus. li. There too the author praises God the Father, who has given a new wisdom to the 'unlearned' and 'rest' to the weary, and he, too, speaks of a yoke.

The whole passage 25–30 forms a sort of poetical hymn. It has been remarked that the allusions to Sirach li. extend over both subdivisions of the passage: for 25 *cp.* Sirach li. 1, and for 28–30 *cp.* Sirach li. 23–27. The historical Jesus would hardly have combined in one hymn a thanksgiving to God for the mercy and privileges which he had granted to his Son with an appeal to the weary to accept the new yoke and find rest for their souls. This is another reason why we must regard the hymn as elaborately composed many years after Jesus's death. Jesus, as Pfleiderer says (*Urchristentum*, I. pp. 667–670), called God his Father in no other sense than he called Him the Father of all mankind; he never claimed for himself a unique, metaphysical, superhuman relation to God. All those who did God's will were his brothers and sisters. This view would be strengthened if what had been 'delivered' to Jesus is not merely the special knowledge of the Father, but, as Pfleiderer thinks, in accordance with Matt. xxviii. 18, 1 Cor. xv. 27, a general and all-embracing authority. But in any case the special relation to God here claimed for Jesus was probably unknown to him. It was rather the creation of the Church.

Originally Jesus was the Son of God because he was the Messiah. But in this passage the relation is metaphysical, and hence its necessarily later date. It may, however, be argued that the passage does not say that before Jesus no one knew God as Father. M. Loisy, quite fairly, insists upon this most strenuously.

'Le rédacteur évangélique n'entend nullement signifier que Dieu n'était pas connu comme père avant la venue de Jésus; il veut dire, et il dit très clairement, que le Christ, le Fils de Dieu, est seul à connaître parfaitement Dieu, le Père, et cela parce qu'il est Fils, tout comme le Père, Dieu, est seul à connaître parfaitement le Christ son Fils, et cela parce qu'il est le Père, parce qu'il est Dieu' (*ib.* p. 81). There was no need for the auditors of Jesus to be told that God was the Father of each one of them, and not merely of Israel as a whole. Even the Evangelist, with all his prejudices, did not perhaps think anything so inaccurate as that.

In his commentary on the Synoptics M. Loisy elaborates his views still further: 'The reciprocity of knowledge between the Father and the Son, though it did not yet imply all the metaphysics of the trinitarian dogma, does not the less imply a relation between God and the Christ which is unique in its nature and may be called transcendent. But the text is only thinking of knowledge, not of power or nature, and if account is taken of the context, it will be even readily admitted that the object of this knowledge is, as regards the Christ, God as Providence ordering the conditions of the salvation of men, and as regards the Father, Jesus as Messiah and as the principal agent of the schemes of Providence. In the whole passage, there is no question of anything but knowledge, knowledge acquired by the humble believers and refused to the wise of this world, knowledge which the Father has of the Son, whom He had sent to make this revelation to the simple, knowledge which the Son has of the Father, whose thoughts of mercy he makes manifest. It may be said that no one knows the Son perfectly and the devotion which binds him to the redemption of humanity, except the Father who sends him, and no one knows the Father and the indulgent kindness which He shows to His creatures, except the Son and those who are taught by him.

'For all that, it is none the less true that these statements carry with them a more absolute meaning. Although Father and Son are not solely metaphysical terms, and although they here stand for God and the Christ, the use of the word Son, without any complement, is extraordinary in the mouth of Jesus; it belongs to the language of tradition, not to that of the Saviour; it marks the immortal Christ, it may even be said, the eternal Christ. The mutual knowledge of the Father and the Son is no longer presented as a relation born in time and attaining its realization at a particular moment; it has the metaphysical character of the similar assertions which are found in the fourth Gospel; it does not express pre-existence, but it assumes it. This declaration is a version of the faith of the Christian community;

it is drawn up as a little doctrinal creed intended to declare the excellence of the revelation of the Gospel.

'The formula "All things have been delivered unto me by my Father" is the link by which this creed had been attached to Jesus's prayer, and it may very well have here the same meaning as in the concluding passage of the Gospel (xxviii. 18). Was the creed the utterance of a Christian prophet, taken over by the author of the prayer? It is more probable that the prayer, the creed and the exhortation which follow it proceed from a single inspiration, as they are all marked by the same rhythm. They form a song of Christian wisdom, the fruit of the Spirit.' 'In any case the words are more like a profession of Christian faith than a teaching of the Saviour. There may be some rashness in trying to prove by this passage that the consciousness of the divine Sonship historically preceded, or logically conditioned in Jesus that of his Messianic vocation' (*E. S.* I. pp. 908, 911).

(*b*) The Yoke of Jesus (28–30)

(Matthew only)

28 'Come unto me, all ye that are weary and are heavy laden,
29 and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of
me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest
30 unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.'

These famous verses are found in Matthew only; but they are closely connected with 25. The 'simple' are also the weary. Moreover, the parallel with Sirach reaches from 25–30. The exquisite grace and tenderness of the words cannot be gainsaid. Yet the words are largely made up of quotations. The last bit of 29 comes from Jer. vi. 16, and the rest is (as has been already pointed out) an adapted echo of Sirach li. 23 *seq.* Moreover, the Hebrew original of Sirach makes the resemblance still closer. li. 26 in the Hebrew runs: 'Put your neck under her yoke, and let your soul accept her *burden*.' As M. Loisy says: 'The author of 28–30 therefore read not only Jeremiah but also Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew, or in some other translation than the Septuagint. In any case the presence of the word "burden" in the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus (although the Syriac conforms to the Greek and also implies מוסר, instead of משא) confirms the theory of the dependence of Matthew. And does it not seem as if he identifies Jesus with the Wisdom, of which Ben-Sira speaks in this passage? The fact is that we shall see him put into the mouth of the Saviour (xxiii. 34–36) words which, in Luke (xi. 49, 50), are attributed to Wisdom. It has been noted above that Ben-Sira gives God the name of "Father" in Ecclus. li. 1 and 10, so that his influence may be also admitted for Matt. 27. The Evangelist has interpreted the prayer of Jesus Ben-Sira in a prayer of Jesus the Son of God. The identification of Jesus with Wisdom might explain the tone of Matt. v. 21, 22, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38, 39, 43, 44; but especially it would account for xi. 27, the mutual knowledge of the Father and the Son being the relation of God with Wisdom' (*E. S.* I. p. 913, n. 3).

The 'heavy burdens,' which make those who seek to carry them 'weary,' are the Rabbinic laws. Jesus contrasts his demands and his religion with the religion and the demands of the Rabbis. Their demands are many and wearisome; a multiplicity of enactments which it is hard for simple folk to fulfil. Those who do not fulfil them are looked down upon and despised. The demands of Jesus are few and easy; he asks only for faith and loyalty and love, and he comes to the simple folk with no pride or haughtiness, not despising but loving them, and seeking to save. For the Rabbinic use and meaning of the phrases 'yoke of the commandments,' 'yoke of the Kingdom of heaven,' 'yoke of the Law,' see Additional Note 45.

The English version, 'for I am meek and lowly in heart,' hardly represents the actual force of the original. Jesus means to say that he, unlike the Rabbis, is condescending (in a good sense) and gentle. W. translates: 'sanftmütig und leutselig,' 'Jesus turns to the ὄχλοι and νήπιοι (the "masses" and the "simple"); he allures them with the fact that he is not haughty, and does not, like the Scribes, despise the people, which knows nothing of the Law.' χρηστός may be translated 'easy,' 'mild,' or 'good' in the sense of being 'good for one.' W. renders 'woltuend.'

While the beauty of the passage is unquestionable, some might feel that it would be more beautiful if spoken of Jesus, than if spoken by him. 'It is pleasanter to hear some one's praise out of another's mouth than out of his own' (Oort, *loc. cit.* p. 327). The historical accuracy of the passage is very dubious. To gauge it raises, however, the whole question of the relation of Rabbis and Rabbinism to the people at large. In the principle of a legal religion there is nothing in itself which make necessarily for pride and exclusiveness. Whatever may have been the case in the age of Jesus and in Galilee, there is no doubt that, before long, the Rabbinic law penetrated all strata of the population, and was felt as a privilege rather than as a burden. The Rabbinic literature shows few or no traces of the Jewish community being composed of two classes, one a small class of Scribes, Rabbis and learned, the other a large class of the ignorant, simple and unhappy. There are few or no traces that, on the one hand, there were a small number of bad, proud people obeying the ritual law and neglecting the moral law; on the other hand, a mass of people, half trying to obey the ritual law and failing, half wilfully violating it, and all neglected, unhappy, and ill at ease. And yet this is what ought to have been the case if the Gospel narrative, and still more, if the German Protestant explanations of that narrative be accurate and unexaggerated. The distant God of judgment, the impossible fulfilment of 'thousands of laws,' the hard and haughty teachers, who were never satisfied, the whip of the Law—all this, on which J. Weiss, *e.g.*, in his recent commentary lays, yet once more, such eloquent and reiterated stress, is pure fiction. It has all been invented by the unhistoric assumption that party documents, like the Gospels, or still more like the Epistles of Paul, must be accurate in their picture of enemies. You might, I think, almost better go to a Jew for an accurate delineation of Christianity than to a Protestant German commentator for an accurate picture of Rabbinic Judaism. The dazzling light they see in the Gospel is only obtained by means of unhistoric shadows to set it off and throw it up.

Nevertheless, a very limited justification of the passage, in the age of Jesus and in Galilee may, up to a certain point, be admitted. Compare what has been said in Additional Note 43 on the *'Am haAretz.* It was only gradually that the Rabbinic law entered into the very heart and marrow of the entire people. Nor did it take this possession of all men's hearts without showing sympathy with human nature, and some comprehension of ordinary human limits and powers.

M. Loisy does not hesitate to argue that even 28 and 29 cannot safely be ascribed to Jesus. He says: 'These touching words which in Matthew follow the eulogy of the Christian revelation are intended to complete it. They are not the logical development of it, and they are linked to it only by a certain similarity in the point of view. It may be readily admitted that the Evangelist found them in the collection of Logia. Nevertheless it is true that in them as in the preceding passage there are discernible certain features of the discourse attributed to the risen Jesus, which seems to belong to the last redaction of Matthew. We find in them a universalist spirit, a general invitation to become the disciple of Jesus. They have a rhythm which is similar to that of the preceding sentence, though less regular. They are composed almost entirely of borrowings from Jeremiah and Ecclesiasticus, and they are more suitable to the glorified Christ, living in the Church, than to the historic Christ. It may be doubted whether Jesus ever spoke of his yoke, even by way of comparison, while for the Evangelist, the yoke of Jesus is the Christian law, so easy and light as compared with the Mosaic Law interpreted by the Pharisees' (*E. S.* I. p. 912). Perhaps too the words are Matthew's universalized equivalent for Mark vi. 31. The words *δεῦτε, ἀναπαύσασθε* are notable.

The great German theologian Harnack, in his book, *Sprüche und Reden Jesu* (pp. 188–216), makes a magnificent defence for the authenticity both of 25–27 and of 28–30.

Upon the basis of an exhaustive examination of the entire manuscript and patristic evidence he shows that the original reading of Luke x. 22 (Matt. xi. 27), and therefore of the passage in Q, ran: *πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα* [or *τίς ἔστιν ὁ πατὴρ*] *εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ*, *i.e.* 'All has been delivered to me by the Father, and no one has known (the aorist, and not the present *γινώσκει*) the Father except the Son, and to whomever the Son reveals him.'

The difference between this version and the present text of Luke and Matthew is considerable.

(1) Instead of 'all has been delivered to me by *my* Father' the original reading was: 'all has been delivered to me by *the* Father.'

(2) Instead of the present *γινώσκει* or *ἐπιγινώσκει* the original reading has the aorist *ἔγνω*.

(3) The clause 'and no man knoweth the Son except the Father' was wanting. Harnack here agrees with W.

The change from the aorist to the present was made in order to turn a historic fact or act into a timeless and eternal and metaphysical relation. The addition of 'no man knoweth the Son except the Father' is really out of place in a passage which has to do with the knowledge of God acquired and revealed by Jesus. It is this new knowledge which has been revealed to the simple through Jesus and for which Jesus thanks God. Moreover the final words, 'and he to whom the Son would reveal (him),' do not fit in with the addition 'no man knoweth the Son except the Father.' The Son is God's interpreter, not his own. That the balance and rhythm of the passage are destroyed by the omission of these words Harnack does not admit.

Let us then assume that the original reading of the passage was what Harnack supposes, and now let us see what Harnack thinks that the passage, in its original form, actually meant, and why he holds that it was spoken by Jesus.

(1) He presses *ταῦτα*, 'these things,' in 25. The saying must have been said on some definite connection and occasion. If it were a 'Christian poem,' and independently created, this allusive

ταῦτα, referring to something which had already happened or gone before, would have been avoided.

(2) Then we have 'Father,' not 'my Father.' Jesus praises God for the teaching which God has given him. The distinction between 'simple' and 'wise' (for the former *cp.* Psalms xix. 7, cxvi. 6, cxix. 130) is quite in accordance with other sayings of Jesus. The bitterness ('Herbheit') which praises God not only because the true knowledge has been revealed to the simple, but also because it has been hidden from the wise, is found in other sayings, and is an indication of originality.

(3) Note the aorists. What God has now done is praised. 'Es muss also ein uns nicht überlieferter offensichtlicher Erfolg dieser Art dem Lobpreis vorangegangen sein.'

(4) The *πάντα* of 27 refers to the teaching. This teaching in its entirety has been delivered by God to him. Thus no one before him knew the Father. '[Die ganze Lehre] ist ihm vom Vater "überliefert," und zwar zuerst ihm, dem Sohne,—er hat nun den Vater kennen gelernt; vor ihm kannte ihn niemand.'

(5) Nothing is said of a constant, still less of a timeless relation of the Son to the Father. Jesus praises God that He has entrusted to him this full knowledge, that he, the Son, has been the first to learn to know the Father, that God has revealed this knowledge through him to the simple, and that this knowledge will also in the future only be revealed through him. 'Es handelt sich durchweg um einen geschichtlich gewordenen Tatbestand.'

So far, perhaps, the sailing has been fairly plain. But how does Harnack deal with the Sonship and the Son's claim to be the first man to have received the knowledge of the Father? He admits that the only clear synoptic parallel for this abstract usage and correlation of the Father and the Son is Mark xiii. 32. Yet this very parallel is, he thinks, significant and important. For in it Jesus's foreknowledge of the future is denied, and hence this verse must certainly belong to the oldest tradition. As to none knowing the Father before Jesus, Harnack says that 'no one' must not be too much pressed. No reflection is intended upon the Hebrew prophets. The statement does not go further than Luke x. 24, 'Many prophets and kings desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not,' or than the verse about John the Baptist, Matt. xi. 11, 'He that is least in the Kingdom of heaven is greater than he.' Harnack boldly admits that if the passage is authentic, Jesus must have called himself (in the latest part of his activity) 'the Son.' 'If the saying belongs to the best and most ancient tradition, it can have been spoken by our Lord only during the later period of His ministry, and it further presupposes that during this period our Lord upon other occasions called Himself "the Son." This conclusion will necessarily be disputed by those who suppose themselves bound not to allow our Lord any other self-designation than that of a Teacher, of a Prophet, and—at the close of His ministry—of the *future* Messiah. But the transition from the designations of Teacher and Prophet to that of the future Messiah demands, both in the self-consciousness of Jesus and also in outward expression, some middle term, and it is difficult to see why tradition must be supposed to be in error when it presents us here with the designation "the Son." If this could mean absolutely nothing else than "I am the present Messiah," then it would be unintelligible; but the concrete situation in which our Lord found Himself limited the sphere of significance of the expression both for Himself and for His hearers. At the present He is the Chosen One, the Beloved One, thus the Son, and therefore in the future—that is, soon—He will come in the clouds of heaven and will receive the office of Messiah, whose function is essentially active. If criticism can produce no valid objections against the tradition that our Lord towards the end of His ministry called Himself the Son of Man (in the sense of Daniel), so, in my opinion, there is still less ground for hesitation in accepting the genuineness of the tradition that our Lord called Himself "the Son," because it is absolutely impossible to imagine how He could have arrived at the conviction that He was the future Messiah without first knowing Himself as standing in an unique relationship to God. What, however, our Lord in this passage says of Himself as the Son, goes beyond what is expressed in other sayings, not in the thought itself, but only in its pregnant form' (*Sayings of Jesus*, E. T., p. 300).

This argument of the great theologian seems however to contain some doubtful inferences. Is it reasonable to suppose that Jesus ever called himself 'the Son' in this absolute and abstract sense, and that Mark (except in one suspicious passage) should say nothing about it? In what sense was he the Son? Harnack would say in the sense that he knew God as Father, and that he believed that no one had known Him so before. But what evidence is there that Jesus had any such idea as to the ignorance of his contemporaries and of all previous generations of the divine fatherhood? Where does he ever hint that his conception of God as the Father of every Jew or every man is something new? Doubtless if he came to believe that he was the Messiah, he stood in a special relation to God inasmuch as God had invested him with special office and duties, but why should this office make him, except in the old Messianic sense, think himself God's Son? Yet if he felt himself God's Son, it was because he felt himself to be the Messiah, and not, as Harnack would have us think, *vice versâ*. His office, his Messiahship, make him God's Son, not his realization that God was his Father.

The close parallelism of the next passage with expressions in Sirach li. makes the verbal parallelism of the opening words of 25 with Sirach li. 1 suspicious. Harnack says that all the parallels are too general to have any weight. But this seems hardly fair. Doubtless most of the great authorities take πάντα in 27 to refer to the teaching. But it can hardly be denied that the phrase is odd. True that the verb παρεδόθη is used of 'handing down' or 'delivering' teaching or tradition, but it seems more suitable of a teaching 'handed down' by man to man than of a teaching given by God to man. (On the other hand it must be admitted that we have the saying 'Moses *received* (קבל) the Law from Sinai.') And even if we take πάντα (all) to mean just what Harnack and others wish, even so, as Pfleiderer has urged, the relation of Jesus to God would remain something unique and exclusive. Such a relation for the superhuman nature of the Christ of the Church is quite obvious, but for the historic Jesus it is scarcely conceivable. The historic Jesus called God 'his' Father only in the same sense as he called Him 'our' Father. All who did God's will were his brothers and sisters, 'sons' like himself of the same God. Moreover a suspicion remains that πάντα (all) is used with a wider connotation than merely of teaching.

So much as regards 25–27. But Harnack also defends 28–30. He sees a certain connection between the two passages both in form and matter: 'As there the first thought is for the revelation itself, and then this revelation is described as being brought about by the Son, so here there is first a general proclamation of the "rest," and then it is said that this rest is attained through the acceptance of *His* yoke.' In the last half of the second passage 'our Lord assigns to His personality a significance both in relation to the character of His commandments and also indirectly in relation to their appropriation; in this point, therefore, there exists a distinct connection in thought with the former saying' (*Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 305, 306.) Nevertheless it is unlikely that the two sayings were originally united together. The situation is different. The first passage deals with the knowledge of God and its revelation; the second with the laws for practical life. The first passage is a 'Lobgebet,' the second a 'Missionsruf.' Luke x. 23, 24 seem the more probable sequel of Luke x. 22. It is, moreover, uncertain whether 28–30 stood in Q at all, as it is wanting in Luke. I would venture to add: is it conceivable that Jesus ever said of himself that he was gentle and lowly? That a man should have said this of himself seems to rob his meekness of beauty and reality. Where in the Synoptics have we a parallel for Jesus thus praising himself as apart from the powers which God had given him? 'Call me not good,' said Jesus; yet here he calls himself very good indeed. Nevertheless Harnack with learning and courage essays the defence. He admits that this 'Selbstbezeichnung' is unique, but 'an Selbstbezeichnungen fehlt es in der guten Ueberlieferung auch sonst nicht.' This self-description is probably Messianic, and depends upon Isaiah xlii. 2 and similar passages. It is confirmed by 2 Cor. x. 1 where Paul speaks of the 'meekness and gentleness of Christ' (πραΰτης καὶ ἐπιείκεια τοῦ Χριστοῦ) as of something well known and almost as a technical term. Hence Paul probably knew Matt. xi. 28–30. Again there is no reference to the cross or to the death. These would scarcely have been wanting in a later made-up poem. The apparent contradiction to sayings in which it says that only through tribulation and hard sacrifice can one enter the Kingdom, or to those in which the Law is maintained and emphasized, is an indication of genuineness rather than the reverse. Harnack's last words, covering both passages, 25–27 and 28–30, are as follows: 'In neither case is the verbal accuracy of the tradition of course guaranteed; but it is decisive for the recognition of the relative genuineness of the sayings that in the first saying the whole emphasis is laid upon the knowledge of God and its revelation, in the second upon the yoke of Jesus in the sense of *commandments*; that, further, in the first saying the primary condition of the knowledge of God is simplicity, while in the second saying the primary condition of the "ἀνάπαυσις" is meekness and lowliness; that, moreover, in both sayings the (Pharisaic) "perfect ones" form the contrast, and everything is strictly confined within the Jewish horizon; and, finally, that in the first saying Jesus is represented as the revealer of the knowledge of God, while in the second He is represented as the instructor and pattern of the quietistic virtues without a single reference to the Cross and Passion. If by the word "Gospel" one understands what St Paul and St Mark understood by this word, then these sayings are not "Gospel sayings" and have nothing in common with the specific conceptions of Paulinism. We have only the choice between assigning them to the creation of a later prophet of the primitive Jewish-Christian community who—strangely enough—omits all reference to the Crucifixion, or assigning them to our Lord Himself. Given the two alternatives, there seems to me no doubt about which to choose' (*Sayings of Jesus*, E. T., p. 310).

The reader has now before him a defence of the two passages by the greatest of living theologians. It seems impertinent, but

I venture to remain quite unconvinced. At any rate my scepticism is shared by Loisy who also had Harnack's book before him. It may be that my own doubts are partly due to the wish that Jesus may not have said these words, for did he do so, he seems to me less great, and more mistaken. But is not Harnack's defence also a little coloured by his wish that Jesus did say the words, that he did call himself 'the Son' and that he did contrast his light and restful yoke with the awful burdens of the Pharisees?

CHAPTER XII

1—8. The Sabbath

(*Cp.* Mark ii. 23–28; Luke vi. 1–5)

1 At that time Jesus went on the sabbath day through the
cornfields; and his disciples were hungry, and began to pluck
2 the ears of corn, and to eat. But when the Pharisees saw it, they
said unto him, 'Behold, thy disciples do that which it is not
3 lawful to do upon the sabbath day.' But he said unto them,
'Have ye not read what David did, when he was hungry, and
4 they that were with him; how he entered into the house of God,
and how they ate the shewbread, which it was not lawful either
for him to eat, or for them who were with him, but only for the
5 priests? Or have ye not read in the Law, how that on the
sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and
6 are guiltless? But I say unto you that what is greater than the
7 temple is here. But if ye knew what it meaneth, I desire mercy,
and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless.
8 For the Son of man is Lord of the sabbath.'

After the discourse given in x. and xi., Matthew now presents a further series of conflicts of Jesus with the Pharisees and of miraculous deeds of power. He starts with a narrative which is drawn from the second chapter of Mark.

5–7 are peculiar to Matthew. Are they also his composition? 'The greater than the Temple' is, of course, Jesus himself, the Messiah. If the passage is the work of the Evangelist, the 'greater than the Temple' argument and phrase would be imitated from xii. 41, 42. In the presence of the Messiah the Sabbath law may be suspended. But, as W. says, the comparison is harsh, for the disciples did not break the law for the benefit, or in the service, of Jesus, but for themselves.

7, 8. The quotation from Hosea had already been used, ix. 13. The argument seems twofold. The disciples should not have been condemned, but pitied for their hunger; secondly, they were guiltless, because they were covered and justified by the presence of the Messiah. The 'Son of man' is here used in its final Messianic sense. The Messiah is the Lord of the Sabbath and can exonerate his disciples from its infraction. To this argument Mark ii. 27 is unnecessary, and so it is omitted.

9–14. Healing on the Sabbath

(*Cp.* Mark iii. 1–6; Luke vi. 6–11)

9, 10 And he departed thence, and entered their synagogue. And, behold, there was a man who had a withered hand. And they asked him, saying, 'Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath day?'
11 so that they might accuse him. And he said unto them, 'What man would there be among you, who, if he had one sheep, and if it fell on the sabbath day into a pit, would not take hold of it, and
12 lift it out? Now how much more precious is a man than a sheep.
13 Wherefore it is lawful to do good on the sabbath day.' Then said he to the man, 'Stretch out thine hand.' And he stretched it out; and it was restored sound like the other one.
14 Then the Pharisees went out, and formed a resolution against him, to destroy him.

The order of Mark is maintained.

10. Matthew makes the hostile critics ask Jesus at once whether healing on the Sabbath is permitted. In Mark they silently watch to see what he will do. Matthew's changes may be due to his desire to bring in the argument and illustration of the next two verses.

11, 12. The illustration, drawn, as Loisy thinks, 'd'un autre récit traditionnel' (*cp.* Luke xiv. 1–6 and xiii. 15, 16), has the same logical fault as the argument in Mark. To save life is one thing; to do good is another. If I can do a certain good deed just as well on Sunday as on Saturday, it is reasonable to argue that, if my doing it involve a breaking of the Sabbath law, I had better postpone it till Sunday. In the illustration, the sheep, if left for a day, would suffer great misery or even die. From a larger point of view it is, however, not unreasonable to say that the Pharisees are supposed to look on healing as a labour, while Jesus looked upon it as a service, a benefit, a deed of mercy. Regarded in this light, it becomes a positive duty, and the notion that it could be technically brought under the rubric of 'work' becomes an absurd abstraction which Jesus brushes impatiently away. For the Rabbinic law as regards healing on the Sabbath, see Additional Note 13.

15–21. MANY HEALINGS

(*Cp.* Mark iii. 7–12; Luke vi. 17–19,

15 But when Jesus became aware of this, he withdrew himself
16 thence. And many followed him, and he healed them all. And he
strictly enjoined them that they should not make him known:—
17 that what was spoken by Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled,
18 who said, 'Behold my servant, whom I chose; my beloved, in
whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my spirit upon him,
19 and he shall proclaim judgment to the nations. He shall not
strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the
20 streets. A crushed reed shall he not break, and smoking flax
shall he not quench, till he hath brought forth judgment unto
21 victory. And in his name shall the nations trust.'

The order in Mark is still followed, though Mark iii. 7, 8, 10, 11 had been also used in iv. 24, 25. Hence the passage is here curtailed. The quotation from Isaiah is peculiar to Matthew, who loves to make the various incidents of Jesus's life a fulfilment of prophecy.

15. Peculiar to Matthew is γνοὺς, 'perceiving it.' Matthew makes the departure of Jesus from Capernaum the consequence of his having heard of the desire of the Pharisees to kill him. The addition is of no value historically. Where Jesus goes to is not stated.

16. It should be noted that Jesus bids those he heals to keep his part in the matter dark, while in Mark the order is only given to the unclean spirits.

18. The quotation from Isaiah xlii. is intended to justify the reticence and reserve of Jesus, and to show that though he did not do what might have been expected of the Messiah, he was the Messiah none the less. The servant of Deutero-Isaiah is here, therefore, given a Messianic interpretation. Utterly unlike as the figures in Isaiah xlii. and liii. are to the figure in Isaiah xi., their identification in Jewish theology is also not unknown. It has already been noted that the Targum regards the servant in Isaiah xlii. as no less the Messiah than the monarch of Isaiah xi. What amazing inconsistencies the human mind can believe at one and the same time!

22–37. Satan and Beelzebul

(*Cp.* Mark iii. 20–30; Luke xi. 14–23, xii. 10)

22 Then was brought unto him one possessed with a demon, who
was blind and dumb: and he healed him, so that the dumb man
23 spake and saw. And all the people were utterly amazed, and
24 said, 'Is this man, perhaps, the son of David?' But when the
Pharisees heard it, they said, 'This man only drives out the
25 demons through Beelzebul the prince of the demons.' And Jesus
knew their thoughts, and said unto them, 'Every kingdom divided
against itself is ruined; and every city or house divided against
26 itself cannot endure. And if Satan drive out Satan, he is divided
27 against himself; how then can his kingdom endure? And if I by
Beelzebul drive out demons, by whom do your children drive them
28 out? therefore they shall be your judges. But if I drive out the
demons by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God hath
29 already come unto you. Or how can a man enter into a strong
man's house, and plunder his goods, unless he first bind the strong
30 man? and then he can plunder his house. He that is not with
me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth.
31 Therefore I say unto you, Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Spirit shall not
32 be forgiven unto men. And whoever speaketh a word against the
Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whoever speaketh
against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in
this world nor in the world to come.

33 'Either hold that the tree is good, and then that its fruit is

good; or hold that the tree is rotten, and then that its fruit is
34 rotten: for the tree is known by its fruit. O offspring of vipers,
how can ye, being evil, speak what is good? for out of that with
35 which the heart overfloweth the mouth speaketh. A good man
out of his good store bringeth forth good: and an evil man out
36 of his evil store bringeth forth evil. But I say unto you, That
of every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account
37 in the Day of Judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified,
and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.'

Passing over Mark iii. 13–19 which has been already given, Matthew now comes to Mark iii. 20–30.

The introduction to the Beelzebul disputation differs from that of Mark. Matthew is here partly dependent upon Q, though as he had already (in ix. 34) used the miracle with which Q introduces the Beelzebul speech, he makes certain alterations. The blind and dumb man seems to be due to, and made up from, the blind men of ix. 27–31 and the dumb man of 32–34. The original story in Q seems best given in Luke xi. 14, 15. If Matthew says, 'the dumb man spoke and saw,' this awkward phrase is due to the fact that in Q's narrative the man was dumb and not also blind.

23. The language is varied from ix. 34 and Luke xi. 14. It reproduces, as Loisy says, ix. 27 which itself anticipates xx. 30 (Mark x. 47). The guess which the crowd makes is here premature. If we are to believe Mark viii. 28, the people had not yet surmised that Jesus might be the Messiah.

24. In Luke the complainants are 'some of the crowd,' which may be the oldest tradition (Q). Mark has 'Scribes from Jerusalem,' and Matthew the Pharisees as a body.

25, 26. For these opening verses of the speech, containing Jesus's defence against the charge, *cp.* Mark iii. 23–25.

27, 28. These verses are peculiar to Matthew and Luke.

Very interesting is the admission on Jesus's part that the Jewish exorcists also succeed in healing the possessed. If the Jewish exorcists do not succeed through diabolic agency, why should that agency be regarded as the source of *his* successes? Thus they, as it were, shall unconsciously judge and condemn the charge of his opponents.

But the concession is out of place here. For if Jesus and the Jews do the same thing, how can the inference in 28 be otherwise than unsound? Why do not the Jewish exorcisms also imply the advent of the Kingdom? 27 impairs the force of 28. Both the verses are, M. Loisy thinks, later than Jesus. They reflect rather the 'preoccupations of Judæo-Christian controversy' than the thought of Jesus. 27 was interpolated first, while 28 serves to make a fresh connection. 29 is the true continuation of 26 (*E. S.* I. pp. 706, 707). Thus even from our existing sources we can distinguish primary and secondary elements in Q. For the interpolations had already been made in Q, when Matthew and Luke read and used this document.

28. The Kingdom of God has already begun with the appearance of Jesus the Messiah. The rule of the devil and his agents is passing away; the rule of God, the new era, has begun. As to how far the idea that the existing order was under the domination of Satan was shared by the Rabbis, see Additional Note 33. This is one of the few verses in which we find in Matthew 'Kingdom of God' instead of 'Kingdom of heaven.' This may be taken as an argument for 28 being an interpolation, if Q indeed used the phrase, 'Kingdom of heaven.' Mr Allen thinks that here, as in xxi. 31 and 43, 'Kingdom of God' is retained for special reasons. 'The Kingdom is here regarded as something present, but only by anticipation. Where the Messiah was, there must be the Kingdom in some sense. But in a fuller sense it was still future, to be inaugurated when he came on the clouds of heaven. The "Kingdom of God" is certainly due to the source used by the editor, in this case probably the Logia' [most commentators would say Q, but Allen's Logia is by no means Q], 'which therefore contained sayings about the Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of the heavens.' [A complicated theory!] 'The reason why the editor did not here substitute the latter for the former no doubt is that he always uses the "Kingdom of heaven" in an eschatological sense which would here be out of place.' The passage is discussed at length, and with similar conclusions, by Wrede in his essay on *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, pp. 98–100.

30. *Cp.* Mark ix. 40; Luke xi. 23. In Mark (and in Luke ix. 50) we have the converse saying used in a tolerant sense: here, and in Luke xi. 23, the saying of Mark is inverted and used in an exclusive sense. They are not necessarily inconsistent, nor is it quite impossible that, on different occasions, Jesus might have said both the one and the other. Here, a test is given by which a man is to test himself. If he is not for Jesus, he is against him. Before, a test was given by which the disciples are to try others: if they are not against Jesus, they are to be considered as for him (Plummer). Nevertheless, W. (*Einleitung*, p. 77) holds that only

the 'tolerant' saying is original, while Loisy takes the reverse view. See Mark ix. 40. W.'s words are worth quoting. The passage is one of those on which he relies to prove the priority of Mark to Q. 'In Mark the narrow-minded zeal of the disciples is restrained, who wish to forbid one who does not belong to their circle from working in the name of Jesus; in Q on the contrary the way is prepared for the principle of *nulla salus extra ecclesiam*, and there is added: he who gathereth not with me, scattereth the herd' (*Einleitung*, p. 77).

31, 32. *Cp.* Mark iii. 28, 29. In S.S. the reading in 32 is: 'whoever blasphemes the Holy Spirit,' not whoever speaks against it. This reading is, Merx thinks, original. The sin was afterwards enlarged: not only blasphemy, but any hostile word, was unpardonable. The parallel in Mark iii. 28, 29 says that all blasphemies shall be forgiven the sons of men except the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. This agrees with Matt. xii. 31. But in 32 another version is given, corresponding with Luke xii. 10, in which it is said that words against the Son of man shall be forgiven, but not words against the Holy Spirit. W. argues ingeniously that the source of this second version probably rests upon a misunderstanding of an earlier reading of Mark. Instead of 'sons of men,' the earlier text read, he thinks, 'Son of man,' but meant by it not the 'Messiah' but 'man.' As 'Son of man' was afterwards regarded as a synonym for Jesus the Messiah, the verse was supposed to mean what we now find in Luke xii. 10 and Matt. xii. 32. Then, in Mark, 'Son of man' was altered to 'sons of men' (an unusual construction), in order that it might not seem as if the meaning were that the Messiah's sins were to be forgiven.

It is certainly clear that 31 and 32 must be variants of one and the same saying. What that saying originally was is less obvious. W. thinks that Mark's version is the original, which is reproduced in 31. The saying in Mark, if for 'men' or 'man' we read 'the Son of man,' as meaning the Messiah or Jesus, becomes unintelligible. An attempted meaning was given to it in Q by changing the phraseology to what we now find in Luke xii. 10. Matthew, finding two different versions (Mark and Q), reproduced the first in 31, the second in 32. But, as W. says, the blasphemy against the Spirit consists in speaking against Jesus (= the Son of man), and thus the opposition or distinction between what is and what is not an unpardonable sin falls to the ground. Hence 32 cannot be authentic and original. Hence, too, perhaps, the reason why Luke removes his version (xii. 10) from the context of his Beelzebul story, which nevertheless is needed to explain it. So too Allen. 'Anything shall be forgiven to men save blasphemy against the Holy Spirit gives a clear and intelligible meaning. On the other hand, opposition to the Son of man is pardonable, opposition to the Holy Spirit is unpardonable, is difficult to explain. How could the Pharisees be supposed to be able to distinguish between the Son of man (= Christ?) acting as such, and the Son of man driving out devils by the power of the Spirit. We have here a fairly clear instance where an original Aramaic phrase meaning "sons of men" = "men" has been mistakenly represented by ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Mark ii. 28 is probably another instance.'

On the other hand, Schmidt supposes that Matthew xii. 32 is one of the original sayings of Jesus where he said 'man,' and was later supposed to have meant himself. But his interpretation, which I will quote, seems to me very strained: 'The enemies of Jesus charged him with performing his cures by the aid of Beelzebub. In this he saw a blasphemy, because he felt that his success in curing the sick was due to the Spirit of God that had come upon him; yet he was careful to distinguish between an attack upon a fellow-man and a denunciation of the Spirit that operated in him, saying: "If anyone speaks against *bar nasha*—*i.e.* man—that may be pardoned him, but he that speaks against the Holy Spirit can have no pardon." No one in the audience could have understood him to say: "You may blaspheme the Messiah with impunity, but not the Holy Ghost." The distinction is clearly between the divine spirit and the human instrumentality. The general principle, that under all circumstances a man should be willing to forgive what is said against him by his fellow-man, put no emphasis upon the maligned speaker. To the Church it was quite a different thing to speak against an ordinary man from speaking against the Christ. The spirit that possessed Jesus was evidently to himself an objective reality. From this divine spirit he distinguished himself. For it he cherished the utmost reverence. That anyone should have called this mysterious, energizing, beautifying, prophetic spirit Beelzebul filled him with horror. How could such a sin be pardoned? The more difficult it was for the Church thus to distinguish between the man Jesus and the divine spirit that, according to his view, dwelt in all God's children, the more probable is the earlier form that comes to view in the Aramaic original. It is possible that words uttered on two occasions have been put together in Matthew's account.' (*Prophet of Nazareth*, p. 112.)

Another view (J. Weiss) is to suppose that Jesus said 'I,' and that for the pronoun 'Son of man' has been substituted. Jesus would mean 'Any insult to me personally will be forgiven; but if you revile the divine spirit which works in me, that is unforgivable.' Harnack, who holds that Jesus used 'Son of man' to mean himself, thinks that the ascription of forgiveness to 'words spoken against the Son of man' is an argument for the priority of Q. Mark's version of 31 is less original than Q's version in 32. *Cp.* the note on Mark iii. 28.

33–35 are closely similar to a paragraph (vii. 16–20) in the Sermon on the Mount. Have we to assume that both passages were in Q, the same idea having been used twice?

33. *Cp.* Matt. vii. 17–19. Its meaning here according to Mr Allen is: 'be consistent. Either allow my acts in casting out devils to be good in result, and attribute the power to do such good acts to the Holy Spirit; or condemn them as evil in result, and attribute them to Satanic agency.' Perhaps, however, the meaning is: your words are evil, therefore your heart is evil. The words are the fruit, the tree is the heart. The rather obscure use of the imperative ποιήσατε in the sense of 'assume' may be due to the original having the simple indicative. 'A good tree makes good fruit.' Verse 34 would justify this explanation of 33. Their words cannot help being bad, for they have bad hearts, and the words of the mouth are the expression of that of which the heart is full.

34. 'Offspring of vipers.' Doubtless not merely a violation of 'Love your enemies,' but a considerable exaggeration. Prof. Burkitt has devised a new theory in order to save the accuracy of Jesus (*The Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 170–174). The Professor is without the faintest tinge or trace of anti-Jewish prejudice; he is also quite open-eyed. Yet he is a sincere and whole-hearted disciple of Jesus, whom in his lectures he habitually calls 'Our Lord.' He wants to do two things. First, as I have said, to maintain the accuracy and propriety of the language of Jesus in his violent attacks upon the Scribes and Pharisees of his day. Secondly, to admit that Rabbinical Judaism can be, and for many centuries, prevailingly was, a spiritual religion.

He achieves his ends by drawing a sharp distinction between Rabbinic Judaism and its teachers before and after the destruction of the Temple. Roughly he would have us believe that the Scribes and Pharisees of the first century were bad, while the Rabbis and Jews after Hadrian and Bar Cochba gradually became spiritual and good. Humility and grace, and even mysticism, can be predicated of the later, but not of the earlier, Judaism.

Now it is at once evident that this view is an immense advance. Prof. Burkitt says: 'Let us be fair to the Jews,' and he is far 'fairer' than ninety-nine out of a hundred of the ordinary 'liberal' Protestant German theologians. His new theory throws over Paul in order to save Jesus. For the German theologians say that the Rabbinical religion is bad, and its teachers are bad, because it is a legal religion. Legalism is the enemy. Now undoubtedly legalism was still more emphatically and predominantly the religion of all Jewish teachers after Hadrian than before him. So if Judaism became spiritual and its teachers good, legalism can produce all that is required. Letter and spirit can go well together. In fact all that we, who have sought to defend the Rabbinic religion from the prejudiced and often ignorant assertions of the German theologians, have claimed for it is now conceded. One can be good and pure and loving and humble and hopeful and truthful and happy not merely through the Gospel, but also through the Law. One can win one's way to the Father without Jesus and without Paul as well as with them. That is all for which we contend. Many pathways to God. Many means to the one result.

The interest—the religious and theological interest—of the question largely falls. If the Rabbis and the Jews of the age of Jesus happened to be bad, that is a historic fact of importance, but its religious significance is comparatively small. At any rate it is independent of the really interesting question: Can legalism produce pure and high religion? This is conceded by Prof. Burkitt. I for my part would not mind—so great is his concession—conceding him, in return, all the bad Jews and bad Rabbis that he requires for the first century in order to save the accuracy of his Master.

Whether *history* can allow his theory is a very different matter. There is indeed some evidence that there were a good many bad Jews at the time when the Temple was destroyed. The Talmudic tradition would seem to show this. The famous passage about the bad Pharisees, which Prof. Burkitt ought really to have quoted, may specially apply for the pre-Hadrianic period. Again, Prof. Burkitt admits that when Jesus attacked *some* Scribes, the reporters and Evangelists may have twisted his words into an accusation against all Scribes. It is most odd to me that the Professor should hesitate to go a step further. Why may Jesus, like Jeremiah, and every other prophet, not also have exaggerated? This seems to me so simple and obvious that I can hardly imagine that a critic like Prof. Burkitt, should not admit it. But apparently he would like to uphold the moral inerrancy of Jesus.

If we assume three things: (*a*) that for some reason or other there were a fair number of bad Jews and bad Rabbis existing about 30 A.D., (*b*) that the reporters exaggerated Jesus, and (*c*) that Jesus himself sometimes exaggerated, we shall perhaps be somewhere near the truth. Neither side need excite itself over this result; the whole battle might be described as drawn; and the quarrel could be regarded as settled.

But whether Judaism *as a religion* was really so very different in 30 from what it was in 300 is rather more doubtful. Is there any good evidence *outside the Gospels* that 'the Rabbinical religion is *not* the immediate descendant of the main current of the Judaism of the 1st century A.D.'? We may put the Sadducean element on one side. Moreover, the Pharisees, even before the fall of the Temple, were not identical with the Zealots. It is true that the revolt of Bar Cochba against Hadrian 'contained a Pharisaic element,' but the deductions made from this fact by Prof. Burkitt seem illegitimate. He says that 'Bar Cochba was supported by Rabbi Akiba, himself in some ways to be regarded as the founder of modern Judaism. Akiba died a martyr, and with him died the last effort of militant Judaism.' What is implied by this? I suppose that 'militant Pharisaism' was bad and unspiritual. But the prevailing Pharisaism of the Rabbis of Jesus's age was not militant, and on the other hand Akiba and many other heroes show that you could be militant and yet not unspiritual. Prof. Burkitt seems to think that when the Temple stood, there were unspiritual inducements to serve God even for people who did not love Him and trust His promises. Why people could not love their country, their Temple, and even desire their political independence, and yet love God, I do not understand. Even after Akiba the hope of restoration of Temple and state still continued. It was passionately prayed for and believed in. Prof. Burkitt misunderstands Judaism when he says that the Jews after Hadrian had learnt that the Kingdom of God was not of this world. Judaism taught and teaches that this world is to become the Kingdom of God. In fact there is no real proof that the Rabbinical religion has been 'metamorphosed from the prevailing Judaism of the 1st century.' Prof. Burkitt says that 'we have a right to believe' that 'the spiritual descendants of the Scribes whom Jesus denounced perished in the two revolts.' This is very kind of him; if not flattering to the Judaism before Hadrian, it is flattering to the Judaism after Hadrian. I fancy the truth is rather that the Scribes of Jesus's day were not so bad as Jesus thought and he thinks, and that the Scribes and the Jews who 'developed and maintained the Rabbinical religion' after Hadrian were less unlike their progenitors than the Professor is kind enough to suppose. Both before and after Akiba Judaism, like Christianity, had its good qualities and its defects.

About one famous passage in Mark vii. the Professor says it is 'dangerous' to disbelieve the Gospel evidence, though what the 'danger' is I do not quite know. The words of Jesus mean that the Scribes and Pharisees regularly teach that a man can evade his duty to his father by a verbal and ritual trick; they seem to me to say more than that a 'religious vow is a more direct service to God and therefore more binding than a man's ordinary duty to his parents.' At any rate they do not, as Prof. Burkitt says, imply that 'some' might think this. They imply that all the Scribes and Pharisees regularly teach and hold this. I do not see why it is dangerous to try to show, as Mr Abrahams will, that Jesus, if he said these words, was mistaken, and that the Scribes and Pharisees never at any time taught, either what I think Jesus meant to say that they taught, or even what Prof. Burkitt thinks that he meant to say.

In fine, when Prof. Burkitt says 'we have a right to believe,' the right seems to me little more than the honourable wish to be just to Judaism and yet to uphold the moral inerrancy of Jesus. I fear that as he has by implication questioned the accuracy of Paul, so will the ultimate historian have to question the accuracy of Jesus. The immense greatness of both will not really suffer from an occasional defect of quality.

35. The 'store' is the heart. As the heart is evil, the words and deeds must be evil too. And contrariwise the evil words betoken an evil heart, so that for evil words condemnation may rightly follow.

36, 37. These two verses may have originally belonged to another connection or been spoken by Jesus on another occasion. In 36 the word ἀργός probably reproduces an Aramaic original, meaning 'vain'—*i.e.* wicked. It does not mean 'idle' in our modern sense. There is no implication that 'acts' will be excluded from the Judgment. 'Cette manière de représenter le jugement n'en a pas moins quelque chose d'artificiel, et l'on peut soupçonner ici qu'une sentence traditionnelle reçoit une application différente de sa signification première' (*E. S.* I. p. 715).

38–42. A SIGN IS ASKED AND REFUSED

(*Cp.* Mark viii. 11–13; Matt. xvi. 1–4; Luke xi. 29–32)

38 Then some of the scribes and of the Pharisees answered him,
39 saying, 'Master, we desire to see a sign from thee.' But he
answered and said unto them, 'An evil and adulterous generation
seeketh after a sign; and no sign shall be given to it, but the
40 sign of Jonah, the prophet. For as Jonah was three days and

three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three
41 days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of
Nineveh shall appear as accusers of this generation, and shall
condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonah;
42 and, behold, more than Jonah is here. The queen of the south
shall appear as accuser of this generation, and shall condemn it:
for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of
Solomon; and, behold, more than Solomon is here.

Between his reproduction of Mark iii. 20–30 and 31–35 Matthew has a paragraph which is parallel with Mark viii. 11–13. The refusal to work a sign was narrated in Q as well as in Mark, and Matthew gives the story twice over, first from Q, and then (xvi. 1–4) from Mark.

38. The particular setting of the story in this verse may be due rather to Matthew than to Q. The wording in Luke xi. 29 is more general. In any case we may take it that in Q the speech about signs followed closely upon the speech about Beelzebul and the incredulity of the Jews.

39, 40. The sign is refused. But an important addition is made to what was said in Mark. For the words are added: 'Except the sign of Jonah.' What is this 'sign'? It might, as W. says, at first sight be supposed that the sign was explained in the next verse but one (41). A foreign prophet preaches to the Ninevites and they repent, whereas Jesus preaches to the Jews and makes no impression. But can this antithesis be called a *sign*? Therefore the sign, says W., though Luke will not have it so, can only be what it is explained to be in 40. The reference is to Jesus's supposed descent into Hades. (This is what is meant by the 'heart of the earth.' The interval between Jesus's death and the resurrection is here three days and three nights. Usually the resurrection is supposed to have taken place 'on the third day,' *i.e.* not seventy-two hours but only some thirty to forty hours after the death.) 41 and 42 then proceed to make a completely fresh point. The Jews are worse than the Ninevites and the Queen of Sheba, and so it will appear in the Judgment. On the other hand, Dr Carpenter holds strongly that 40 is a very late addition and gloss. See *First Three Gospels*, pp. 43, 294. J. Weiss agrees. The 'sign,' he thinks, is the Judgment which is to come. If the Ninevites had not repented, the destruction of Nineveh would have shown them that Jonah was a true prophet of God. If Jesus's contemporaries do not repent and believe, the Judgment will be the sign for them that Jesus spoke truly. Harnack argues that what Luke has in

xi. 30, 'For even as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man to this generation,' was original and in Q. Matthew replaced it by his 40 which Luke would not have omitted had he known it. The sign to the Ninevites was simply the preaching of Jonah—that a prophet came and spoke among them. As against this view W.'s arguments in the *Einleitung*, p. 76, are cogent.

But another view of the passage is suggested by Völter (who is keen to show that Jesus never called himself the Son of man). He thinks that Q merely said 'no sign shall be given to this generation.' And the following argument was that if the preaching of Jonah sufficed to make the Ninevites repent, much more then should the preaching of Jesus suffice for the repentance of the Jews. The addition 'except the sign of Jonah' was added because it was believed that his resurrection brought Jesus into still closer relationship with Jonah. This was indicated more fully in 40, which, though not added by Luke, is yet implied in xi. 30 (Jesus *will* be a sign such as Jonah was, by his resurrection). In Matt. xvi. 4 the sign of Jonah is again interpolated, but Mark viii. 12 is free of it (*Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu*, pp. 19–22).

Loisy also holds that 'except the sign of Jonah' was interpolated in Q as well as 40. Jesus only said what we find in Mark, 'No sign shall be given to this generation.' Then, before Matthew and Luke were written, an interpolator added both 'except the sign of Jonah' and verse 40 in the source (*i.e.* in Q). It was the mention of Jonah in 41 which suggested the fish, and hence we get the sign of Jonah and its application, which Matthew has retained. It is very inapposite, because (*a*) Jesus was not in the tomb more than one day and two nights before the resurrection, (*b*) Jonah's residence in the fish was no sign to the Ninevites who knew nothing about it, and (*c*) the resurrection of Jesus was no sign to the Jews to whom the risen Jesus was not manifested. On the other hand Luke's version is not more original than Matthew's. Here Loisy agrees with W. The wording of Luke xi. 30 shows that he knew Matt. xii. 40. Luke has 'attenuated' Matthew. He has made Jonah 'the sign' to the Ninevites in that Jonah prophesied the destruction of Nineveh in 40 days. In the same way Jesus is a 'sign,' or gives a 'sign,' to his contemporaries, in that he foretells the ruin of Jerusalem and the Jews. But this is to make the 'sign' no real sign at all.

B. Weiss makes the sign of Jonah Jesus's wonderful escape from death, *i.e.* his resurrection. It is assumed in Luke xi. 30 that Jonah used his own wonderful escape from death as a sign to the Ninevites. The details of Matt. xii. 40 may be later than

Q, but even this is by no means certain. *Quellen*, A, p. 75, B, pp. 37, 38.

41, 42. The translation follows W. The literal meaning of the words is 'rise up in the Judgment with this generation.' But 'rise up' does not apparently mean 'rise' at the resurrection; it means no more than 'appear.' Moreover W. argues that the words 'rise up in the Judgment with this generation and condemn it' can only be properly understood by a retranslation into Aramaic. 'Rise up in the Judgment with' is then seen to mean 'accuse.' 'Condemn' means 'cause the condemnation,' not by words, but by the very fact that Nineveh repented, whereas the contemporaries of Jesus did not. The implied period of accusation is equally the final Judgment day in W.'s interpretation as in the usual rendering.

Jesus seems to make the mistake, common to most religious reformers, of confusing disbelief in himself and in his pretensions with moral obliquity. But the one had nothing necessarily to do with the other, and was often wholly independent of it.

Some modern theologians are delighted that Jesus refuses to work a miracle: they would prefer that his biographies did not contain so many miracles as they do. They like to think that the wicked Jews and Pharisees had a *lust* for wonders and signs. 1 Cor. i. 22 is enough for them to prove conclusively that the charge of Jesus is true. I am by no means sure that it is. These theologians cannot, at any rate, have it both ways. If the Jews were so very hard-hearted and bad because they did not believe in Jesus, even though he worked miracles and wonders, they cannot also be charged with a lust for 'signs.' On the other hand, as both the Rabbis and Jesus performed, by Jesus's own admissions, exorcisms of the same kind, it was not so irrational to ask for a sign from heaven of a different sort, which the Rabbis would presumably have been unable to achieve. Dr Plummer says fairly enough: 'Some have interpreted "a sign shall not be given" as meaning either that Jesus wrought no miracles, or that he refused to use them as credentials of his divine mission. It is sufficient to point to Luke xi. 20 (Matt. xii. 28), where Jesus appeals to his healing of a dumb and blind demoniac as proof that he is bringing the Kingdom of God to them. The demand for a sign and the refusal to give it are no evidence as to Christ's working miracles and employing them as credentials. What was demanded was something quite different from wonders such as prophets and (as the Jews believed) magicians had wrought. These Scribes and Pharisees wanted direct testimony from God himself respecting Jesus and his mission, such as a voice from heaven or a pillar of fire. His miracles left them still able to doubt, and they ask to be miraculously convinced. This he refuses.'

43-45. THE RELAPSE

(*Cp.* Luke xi. 24-26)

43 'But when the unclean spirit hath departed out of a man, it
passeth through desert places, seeking rest, and findeth none.
44 Then it saith, I will return into my house whence I departed;
and when it hath entered, it findeth it empty, swept, and
45 garnished. Then it goeth, and taketh with it seven other spirits
more wicked than itself, and they enter in and dwell there:
and the last state of that man becometh worse than the first.
Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation.'

In this passage we have, if we can, to distinguish four things. (1) What the passage meant originally, (2) what it meant to the first compiler—the compiler of Q, (3) what it meant to Luke, (4) what it meant to Matthew. As regards the fourth the key is found in the last words of verse 45, words which must have been added by Matthew, who is also responsible for the position of the whole paragraph, which in Luke comes before the demand for a sign and immediately after the conquered warrior (Matt. xii. 29). (B. Weiss indeed (*Quellen*, A, p. 76) thinks that its present position as well as the last words of 45 are both original, but this is very unlikely.) Matthew means that this generation which at first showed some welcome and appreciation of Jesus is now relapsing, The second state is becoming, and will be, like that of the devil-possessed man, worse than the first. The temporary acceptance and belief given and shown by many Jews to Jesus in his early career is ending as badly as when a man possessed with a demon and then cleansed of it, suffers a relapse. To Luke, and perhaps to Q, the passage may have meant that unless a man wholly attaches himself to Jesus, he becomes his enemy. If he is not fully with him, he becomes against him. Partial acceptance is of no avail. It will end as badly as the case of a man to whom the expelled demon returns with its companions. Or the passage may refer to the admission that Jewish exorcists can also heal. Such healings are often not real and complete, for the demon comes back with many a colleague, and the last state of the unfortunate demon-possessed man is worse than the first. The original meaning of the passage is very hard to see. Loisy supposes that it must not be construed metaphorically. It means that of those persons who have had their demons expelled from them by Jesus, only those are guaranteed against the return of the demons in an even strengthened form who will receive the Word and attach themselves to him who is stronger than Satan. This is ingenious but there is nothing in the text to justify it directly. Looked at generally, as W. says, the words seem to contain a sharp criticism of all exorcisms. They are of no permanent use; relapses take place which make the evil only worse. But Jesus could not have meant to go so far as this. So perhaps we must accept Loisy's explanation in default of a better (*E. S.* I. p. 719).

43. The demon has no body of its own, but lodges in a strange body. Driven from this, it wanders in the wilderness, but soon seeks another resting-place, and if it finds none, it returns to the old home from which it had been expelled. Demons were commonly supposed to dwell in deserts. Allen quotes some apt incantations from Babylonia, found in Thompson's *Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia*, I. pp. 123, 139.

44. 'The unclean spirit makes its dwelling also unclean. At its return it is pleased to find that its dwelling has (at its previous expulsion) been swept and garnished, as if it had been only sent away for the sake of a spring cleaning' (W.).

The passage is written in a sort of half jocular, half ironical vein, which is very peculiar. At the same time there is no reason to doubt that Jesus shared these popular superstitions. The impartial historian who 'stands above' his material is not concerned to find in Jesus every moral and religious perfection, just as on the other hand, he is not anxious to whittle down his originality. In this position of impartiality and detachment the liberal Jew should find himself placed. Thus he, if any one, ought ultimately to be able to judge and assess the moral and religious worth of Jesus with some approach to accuracy.

46–50. JESUS AND HIS FAMILY

(*Cp.* Mark iii. 31–35; Luke viii. 19–21)

46 While he yet talked to the people, behold, his mother and his
48 brothers stood without, desiring to speak with him. But he
answered and said unto him that told him, 'Who is my mother?
49 and who are my brothers?' And he stretched out his hand
toward his disciples, and said, 'Behold my mother and my
50 brothers. For whoever doeth the will of my Father who is in
heaven, *he* is my brother, and sister, and mother.'

Matthew now returns to Mark's third chapter, and continues where he had broken off (Mark iii. 29 = Matt. xii. 32).

46. Matthew had not said that Jesus was in a house.

47 should be omitted. It is wanting in the best MSS.

48. Matthew omits Mark iii. 31; hence the harshness of Jesus's reply is unexplained and unmotived. Note, too, that though he had been speaking to the 'multitudes,' he limits the reference to the disciples when he says, 'Behold my mother and my brothers.' We can hardly doubt that the ideal pictured to us in these verses was at least suggested by Deut. xxxiii. 9. Nevertheless it seems un-Jewish. Deut. xxxiii. 9 has not been regarded as an ideal by the general run of Jewish teaching, but the words of Jesus became an ideal to a large number of Christians. Detachment from family life, a non-recognition of family obligations in the supposed higher interests of religion, have followed from the teaching of Jesus. They did not follow in Judaism from the isolated words in Deuteronomy.

CHAPTER XIII

1–23. THE PARABLE OF THE SOWER

(*Cp.* Mark iv. 1–20; Luke viii. 4–15)

1 The same day Jesus went out of the house, and sat down by
2 the side of the lake. And crowds of people were gathered unto
him, so that he went into a boat, and sat down; and the whole crowd
3 stood on the shore. And he spoke many things unto them in
4 parables, saying, 'Behold, a sower went out to sow. And as he
sowed, some seed fell by the way side, and the birds came and ate
5 it up. Some fell upon stony ground, where it had not much
earth: and it sprang up quickly, because it had no depth of earth.
6 And when the sun rose up, it was scorched; and because it had
7 no root, it withered away. And some fell among thorns; and the
8 thorns sprang up, and choked it. But some seed fell upon good
ground, and bore a crop, part an hundredfold, part sixtyfold, part
9 thirtyfold. Who hath ears, let him hear.'

10 And the disciples came, and said unto him, 'Why speakest
11 thou unto them in parables?' He answered and said unto them,
'Because to you it hath been given to know the mysteries of the
12 kingdom of heaven, but to them it hath not been given. For
whoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have abundance:
but whoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that
13 which he hath. Therefore speak I to them in parables: because
seeing, they see not, and, hearing, they hear not, neither do they
14 understand. And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah,
which saith, Ye shall indeed hear, but ye shall not understand;
15 and ye shall indeed see, but ye shall not perceive: for this people's
heart is waxed fat, and their ears are heavy of hearing, and they
have closed their eyes; lest haply they should see with their eyes,

and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should turn again, and I might heal them.

16 'But happy are *your* eyes, that they see: and *your* ears, that
17 they hear. For verily I say unto you, Many prophets and righteous men have desired to see what ye see, and have not seen; and to hear what ye hear, and have not heard.

18, 19 'Do ye, then, hear the parable of the sower. When any one heareth the Word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, then cometh the Wicked One, and snatcheth away that which was sown in his heart. This is he who was sown by the way side.
20 But he that was, as it were, sown on stony ground, is he that heareth the Word, and immediately receiveth it with gladness.
21 Yet hath he not root in himself, and so endureth but for a time: for when affliction or persecution ariseth because of the Word,
22 immediately he falleth away. He that was sown among thorns is he that heareth the Word; and the care of the world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the Word, and it remaineth un-
23 fruitful. But he that was sown on good ground is he that heareth the Word, and understandeth it; he accordingly beareth a crop, and bringeth forth, now an hundredfold, now sixtyfold, now thirtyfold.'

Still following Mark's order Matthew now comes to Mark's fourth chapter and the parables. Matthew gives us a larger number of them than Mark.

1. Matthew gives an appearance of preciseness and accuracy by adding the words 'on that day.' He had not himself mentioned a house before, but it is mentioned in the previous narrative of Mark (iii. 20). It is another awkwardness of Matthew that he makes Jesus sit down by the shore of the lake and then immediately get into a boat and sit down again. 'On dirait que la première indication, reproduite de l'introduction au discours sur la montagne, est pour marquer la solennité de la circonstance, et que la seconde est prise de Marc, comme indication de fait' (*E. S.* I. p. 733, n. 2).

10. Matthew avoids the awkwardness of Mark's 'when they were alone,' but he falls into another, for the disciples now ask the question and receive the answer in the presence of the 'people.' The disciples ask generally: 'Why does Jesus speak in parables?' Later on Jesus explains the parable of the sower without an extra special request.

11-13. Matthew somewhat softens the full acerbity of Mark. Jesus does not speak in parables *in order* to darken the Jews, and *in order* not to be understood by them: he speaks in parables that, while the Jews may not understand, the disciples may apprehend the true meaning. It is, as M. Loisy points out, a rather awkward compromise: why should not Jesus have left the people to themselves, and told the disciples the truth direct without figure or parable? Matthew in his softening is as unhistoric as Mark (*E. S.* I. p. 745).

For Mark's 'mystery,' Matthew has the plural. Mr Allen has noticed that it is characteristic of Matthew to prefer plurals, but nevertheless he tries to find an elaborate reason for this particular plural. 'The singular might suggest that the very conception of the Kingdom was something unknown. But the idea of the Kingdom was current and familiar. Christ's teaching about it contained, however, many things unfamiliar.' As to the word 'mysteries' or 'secrets' Mr Allen rightly adds that 'the representation of eschatological ideas, immortality of the soul, resurrection of the body, future judgment, Messianic Kingdom as "secrets" revealed to the elect, is especially characteristic of the Apocalyptic and Sybilline literature, and the word in this sense has been adopted by the New Testament writers.'

12. This verse is equivalent to Mark iv. 25. *Cp.* also Matthew xxv. 29; Luke xix. 26. The words, as Mr Allen says, 'seem to refer to spiritual opportunities. The disciples "had," *e.g.*, faith to receive the revelation of the secrets of the Kingdom. Hence these secrets were entrusted to them. The masses of the people "had not" such capacity for divine truth. Hence these secrets were withheld from them, because the parabolic form in which Christ taught them only yielded its "secret" to those who already had some understanding of the nature of the secrets concerned.'

The more probable meaning of the second clause is that given by Loisy. 'The mass of Jews, ignorant of the Kingdom which Jesus is announcing, will become blind as well, and will lose the little spiritual light which they may have had before.' That little is probably 'the truth of the Law, which remains the acquisition of the Christian, and which is lost for the Jew by his rejection of the Gospel' (*E. S.* I. pp. 745, 746).

13. Jesus speaks in parables because the Jews do not understand. This comes to much the same thing as if it were said that the *object* of his speaking in parable is that they may not understand. 'If it is not expressly said that Jesus makes use of parables to produce the blindness of the Jews, the idea is almost the same. Jesus uses the parable because it has not been given to the Jews

to know the mysteries; he does so therefore in order not to reveal to them the mysteries which are the subject of his discourses. If the Jews see without seeing, it is the effect of the will of Providence which forbids them the knowledge of the truths of salvation; but it is implied that the parable is the instrument of this will, being the mysterious enigma which men hear without hearing, because they hear the enigma, but do not understand the mystery. The quotation from Isaiah supports this explanation' (*E. S.* I. p. 746).

It is not correct to interpret, with J. Weiss: because the people refuse to see, therefore the secrets of the Kingdom are withheld. This interpretation attempts, at the expense of accuracy, to minimize the immorality of the doctrine of a predestined or prearranged mental darkening. So too Mr Allen vainly tries to soften the statement when he says that it is implied that parables are used because all who had capacity to understand would be able to penetrate their meaning, while they (the parables) would shroud the divine 'mysteries' from those who had no qualification for appreciating them. The only defence of the statement is to say that because of previous sins the Jews have had their capacity for understanding the truth darkened or taken away. And it may be argued that this is merely the ancient way of saying that previous sin has dulled or removed the capacity of religious apprehension.

Merx has an immensely long critical discussion by which he proves, as he believes, that the original reading was: 'I speak to them in parables *because* their heart is fat.' This would get rid of the necessity of regarding the verse as a later insertion. Jesus would say that he has to speak in parables because the people cannot understand more abstract teaching, not that he speaks thus in order that they may not understand him. But Merx's arguments, however learned, seem vitiated by his clinging to the hypothesis that Matthew is earlier than Mark.

16, 17 are not in Mark. In Mark the disciples ask for the meaning of the parable, and are (iv. 13) rather scolded that they do not understand it. In Matthew (verse 10) they only ask why Jesus speaks in parables, and they are accounted happy for their higher privileges and intelligence. The verses occur in Luke in another and better connection (x. 23, 24). It is clear that what the disciples are fortunate to see and hear is the Messiah.

18, 19. 'Matthew omits "The sower sows the word" (Mark iv. 14). This is no error, but intention. He is no longer thinking of the sowing and the seed, but only of the sown field, and this field is for him (like the vineyard) the Kingdom of God; and by the Kingdom he understands, as usual, the Christian community, or, as one may say, the Church. xiii. 24 *seq.* shows that, but 19–23 shows it also, and not merely in the omission of Mark iv. 14, but also in slight changes which are made in Mark's text. The hearers, to Matthew, are no longer the soil on which the seed falls, but the plants (*cp.* xiii. 38, xv. 13) which grow from the seed' (W.).

24–30. The Wheat and the Tares

(Matthew only)

24 Another parable he laid before them, saying, 'The kingdom of
heaven is likened unto a man who sowed good seed in his field:
25 but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed weeds among the
26 wheat, and went his way. But when the blade had sprung up,
27 and brought forth fruit, then appeared the weeds also. So the
servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst
not thou sow good seed in thy field? whence then has it weeds?
28 He said unto them, An enemy has done this. The servants said
29 unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? But
he said, No; lest while ye gather up the weeds, ye root up also
30 the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest:
and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, First gather
together the weeds, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but
bring the wheat into my barn.'

The parable is based upon Mark iv. 26–29. It is not found in Luke. Holtzmann conjectures that Matthew wished to show how the normal development of the Kingdom is crossed and broken in upon through the mixture of good and evil within its own limits. The parable is allegory from the start: it is framed for its explanation (in 36–43). Loisy shows this too at great length: yet he thinks that the parable as we now have it, though considerably later than Jesus, may be based upon a shorter one which goes back to him.

In 1–9 the seed sown is only good seed; here there is both good seed and bad seed. But, as W. says, what is thought of is not the seed, but the good and bad products of the seed, the good and bad plants, within the Christian community. The two elements are to be allowed to grow up together; to tear up the bad would only endanger the good. At the harvest (*i.e.* the last Judgment) God will Himself see to the reward and the punishment.

It may be asked why would the destruction of the bad plants endanger the good? What was in the writer's mind? Did he mean that God alone could know and distinguish the good from the bad? If so, that is a new and noble idea. Any way, the parable preaches tolerance. Would that the Church had taken its lesson to heart!

Holtzmann thinks that the 'original idea' of the parable certainly goes back to Jesus himself. That idea is that 'sinners' must not be kept aloof. There must be communion with them. Jesus, no doubt, did not keep aloof from sinners; that is his glory; but did he conceive of the Kingdom, even in its earthly stage, as long *including* sinners? Here is the difficulty. For this passage seems to be the clearest of the eleven cases (see note on v. 3) where the Kingdom must mean the present Kingdom, as realized in the Christian community. Mr Allen, however, on the other hand, thinks that even in all the passages of chapter xiii. the future interpretation of the Kingdom can and should be maintained. He says: 'In xiii. we have a series of illustrations intended to throw light upon the nature of the Kingdom. But it is clear that no definition of the Kingdom can be deduced with certainty from them. They can only be used as illustrations of a conception which is already clearly defined. In some of these parables the Kingdom might seem to denote an abstract principle, the divine sovereignty, so that Kingdom of heaven would be equivalent to the will of God. In others it lends itself easily to definition as the Church, the Christian society in which the principle of recognition of the divine sovereignty finds expression. But without enquiring into the ideas involved in the phrase as used by Christ Himself, it seems probable that, so far as the editor of this Gospel is concerned, we should give to the phrase in these parables the meaning which it seems to bear elsewhere in the Gospel; *i.e.* the meaning of the coming Kingdom to be inaugurated at the end of the age. Thus in xiii. 24–30, 36–43, the story deals with the period of preparation for the Kingdom which is to be set up at the end of the age (43). The world during this period is compared to a field. Christ the Son of Man (37) has sown in it the good seed of the knowledge of the true nature and near approach of the coming Kingdom. But in the meantime the devil also sows tares, *i.e.* false teaching. The good seed ripens to maturity in the "sons of the Kingdom," *i.e.* those who are destined to enter into it (*cp.* the same phrase of the Jews in viii. 12). The tare seed develops into unbelievers, *i.e.* sons of the evil one (38), *i.e.* those who partake of his nature, and who will be excluded from the Kingdom. The end of this period of preparation is likened to a harvest (39). Then the Son of Man will come and inaugurate the Kingdom. From it will be excluded the wicked, whilst the righteous will shine forth in it like the sun. The teaching of the parable of the sower (3–23) seems to be to the same effect. The seed is the "Word of the Kingdom" (19), *i.e.* the doctrine of its near advent, and of the requirements of entry into it. This must fall into receptive hearts if it is to develop into the righteousness which qualifies for admission into the Kingdom. The short parables of the mustard seed (31, 32) and of the leaven (33) seem to illustrate the quick spreading and deeply penetrating influence of the doctrine of the Kingdom. Two other parables, the hid treasure (44) and the goodly pearl (45, 46) teach the lesson that a man must strain every nerve and give up all else that he may acquire the right to enter into the Kingdom. Lastly, the parable of the drag net (47–50) describes the doctrine of the Kingdom as a truth which attracts disciples of different qualities, some good, some bad. At the end of the Age, when the Kingdom is inaugurated, there will be a separation.' It seems, however, very doubtful whether this eschatological and future sense of the Kingdom can, in Matthew, be so thoroughly carried through. In the drag net, for instance, the good and bad persons are surely in the Kingdom already. The Christian community exists in them, and the community is already the Kingdom. Not indeed the completed or perfected Kingdom, but still the Kingdom as begun, though not as purified and perfected at the end of the Age.

31–35. THE MUSTARD SEED AND THE LEAVEN

(*Cp.* Mark iv. 30–34; Luke xiii. 18–21)

31 Another parable he laid before them, saying, 'The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took,
32 and sowed in his field. Now it is the least of all the seeds: but when it is grown, it is the greatest among plants, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof.'

33 Another parable spoke he unto them; 'The kingdom of heaven is like unto yeast, which a woman took, and buried in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened.'

34 All these things spoke Jesus unto the people in parables; and
35 without a parable spoke he not unto them: that that might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, 'I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world.'

32. W. has the significant note, 'Die Christliche Gemeinde muss überraschend schnell gewachsen sein.'

The contrast intended is between the small beginning ('a little preaching and a few healings') and the great result (J. Weiss). M. Loisy hesitatingly thinks both parables can perhaps be ascribed to Jesus. The meaning is in both cases the same. 'Jésus fait valoir le contraste d'une cause chétive en apparence, et d'un petit commencement, avec un grand résultat....Nonobstant l'humilité de ses débuts, car il n'est pas question d'obstacles, le royaume viendra dans sa grandeur et dans sa gloire.' M. Loisy, however, allows that this eschatological interpretation is not certain. For Matthew at least the disciples are the leaven, and its action may signify the diffusion of Christianity throughout the world. In that case these two parables, like that of the tares in its present form, would be the product of tradition or the work of a redactor (*E. S.* I. p. 772).

33. This parable is not in Mark. Leaven is elsewhere a principle of evil; here it is the driving, penetrating ferment of good. The Christian community is the leaven, as elsewhere it is called the salt, of the world. The leaven will ultimately transform the face of the whole world. In order to keep to his single, eschatological interpretation of the Kingdom of heaven, Mr Allen has to say that this parable, like that of the mustard seed, describes the propagation of the *doctrine* of the Kingdom. Like leaven, this will spread rapidly, until it has accomplished the purpose for which it was taught. This seems somewhat strained.

35. Matthew, as usual, likes to show the fulfilment of a Biblical passage. Here, oddly enough, it is no prediction of a prophet, but the statement of a psalmist of which he sees a fulfilment (Psalm lxxviii. 2). The psalmist is called a prophet. In some MSS. he is said to be Isaiah. The point of the quotation is partly or predominantly contained in the last words: 'things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world' are now revealed by Jesus. The Kingdom of God upon earth which Jesus has now started and ushered in, was hidden with God from the beginning. It was predestined, fore-ordained.

As 34, 35 must be meant, like Mark iv. 33, 34, to be a conclusion to the parables, it is noticeable that more parables are added. 36–52 is thus probably a later appendix, bringing up the number of parables to the favoured seven. But M. Loisy thinks that this deduction is false. He thinks that the parables of the treasure, pearl and net, like the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven, come from Q and are authentic.

36–43. INTERPRETATION OF THE PARABLE OF THE WHEAT AND THE TARES

(Matthew only)

36 Then Jesus sent the people away, and went into the house.
And his disciples came unto him, saying, 'Explain unto us the
37 parable of the weeds in the field.' He answered and said unto
38 them, 'He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; the field
is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but
39 the weeds are the children of the Wicked One; the enemy that
sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the Age; and
40 the reapers are the angels. As the weeds are gathered together
41 and burned in the fire; so shall it be at the end of the Age. The
Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather
together out of his kingdom all those who have caused men to go
42 astray, and doers of lawlessness; and they shall cast them into
the furnace of fire: there shall be the wailing and the gnashing
43 of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the
kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears, let him hear.

Here we have allegory full blown. Parables may be spoken; allegories are thought out and written down. The position of Jesus is already tolerably developed. He is the 'Son of man' in the apocalyptic sense. The Kingdom is his kingdom; he is the Judge; angels are at his disposal.

38. In 37 the seed which is sown is the teaching; in 38 the good seed are men, 'children of the Kingdom.' These are the true, good Christians in the Christian community or Church. Mr Allen, to suit his general theory, explains: 'those who are qualified to enter it' (the Kingdom).

39. The phrase *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος* is apocalyptic (Authorised and Revised Versions, 'end of the world'; Revised Version margin, 'consummation of the age'; *cp.* Daniel ix. 27, xii. 4, 13). It occurs elsewhere in the New Testament in Matt. xiii. 40, 49, xxiv. 3, xxviii. 20; Heb. ix. 26. It means the end of the present order and the period of the final Judgment.

41. *σκάνδαλα* is a hard word to translate. 'They that cause stumbling' is hardly strong enough. Here the 'scandala' are persons. They are false or bad Christians, who must be allowed

to remain within the flock till the End, when final judgment and punishment await them; *cp.* vii. 23.

The 'doers of lawlessness' (*cp.* vii. 23) are the antinomians and false prophets (*cp.* xxiv. 11) who caused the Church much trouble in the second century. The question how far such heretics and evildoers were to be tolerated or eradicated is, Pfleiderer thinks, also alluded to in xviii. 17, which, like the present passage, reflects the second century and not the early part of the first. The writer believes that they are not to be destroyed till the end of the world and the final Judgment. It may be also noted that the Kingdom of the Son of man is already existent in the Church. The Kingdom of the Father will only come at the end of the world.

42. The conception of hell or Gehenna is just the popular one. For 43, *cp.* Dan. xii. 2.

44–46. The Treasure and the Pearl

(Matthew only)

44 'Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field; which a man found and concealed, and in his joy he went and sold all that he had, and bought that field.

45 'Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant, seeking
46 goodly pearls: who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it.

Here we have a very simple illustration of a true parable. The details are not to be pressed or allegorized. We must not enquire: Was the man justified in concealing his find? The whole point of the parable is the joy with which the man finds the treasure, and his abandonment of everything else in order to secure it. So must each individual sacrifice everything else in order to obtain the highest good, the Kingdom of God. 'De même que l'homme au trésor a fait un bon marché en sacrifiant son petit avoir, de même le croyant fait une excellente affaire en sacrifiant pour le royaume tous les biens de ce monde; à ce prix le royaume est encore donné pour rien' (*E. S.* I. p. 784). The point of the next parable is precisely the same. As to the possible conflict between social duty and the salvation of the individual soul, see note on Mark ix. 1.

This is the second of the parables which are peculiar to Matthew. W. observes that the sections in his Gospel which occur neither in Luke nor Mark consist largely of parables about 'the Kingdom.' And the Kingdom is already partly realized in the Church. (The word ἐκκλησία only occurs in Matt. xvi. 18, xviii. 17.) God is the King or lord or owner of it, and in it live and work his slaves or household or sons. The metaphor of sons and the metaphor of slaves are used with the same connotation. Neither Matthew nor Luke thinks it unchristian to compare the relationship of the good Christian to God with the relationship of master and slave. The Kingdom, as so far realized upon earth, *i.e.* the Christian community, contains both good members and bad. Not till the Judgment will there be a separation between them, when the good will enter into 'glory'—*i.e.* into the Kingdom as definitely constituted in its final and perfect form—and the bad will be hurled into hell. In W.'s opinion these characteristics of Matthew show that much or most of what is special and peculiar to him is later than Jesus. But J. Weiss, on the contrary, urges the indubitable authenticity of 44–46. And it must be admitted that here Matthew's supposed identification of the Kingdom with the Church need not be assumed. See below.

47–50. The Parable of the Net

(Matthew only)

47 'Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was
48 cast into the sea, and collected fish of every kind. And when it
was full, they drew it to shore, and sat down, and collected the
49 good into vessels, but the bad they cast away. So shall it be at
the end of the Age: the angels shall go forth, and sever the
50 wicked from the righteous, and shall cast them into the furnace
of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.

The parable has much the same meaning as the wheat and the tares. But it is less cogent, because the sifting of the bad from the good follows too closely upon their appearance. Loisy would separate 47, 48 from 49 and 50; he would claim 47, 48 for Jesus. His preaching is the work which prepares the way for the grand drama to be inaugurated by the Judgment. It is the means to an end, and only the end will give perfection to the means.

But certainly the case for 44–46 is much stronger than the case for the wheat and the tares or for the net. For there is no strict need or compulsion to interpret the Kingdom in the parables of the treasure and the pearl as already present or as identified with the Church. The Kingdom is here the *summum bonum*, the end of all earthly striving, the one thing really worth living for. It is rather future than present, something for which a man yearns and struggles rather than something into which or amid which he is born.

And in these short parables we recognize too that fine novel note of Jesus's teaching—its passion, its enthusiasm, its glow. There is to be no compromise; no half measures will serve our turn. The great end demands and deserves our complete self-surrender. To gain the great prize we must give our all. But the all is infinitely less than the prize. It is this urgency and *abandon*; this intensity and absoluteness, which constitute in large measure the newness and originality, as also the appealingness and driving force, in the teaching of Jesus.

51, 52. THE HOUSEHOLDER AND HIS TREASURE

(Matthew only)

51 'Have ye understood all these things?' They said unto him,
52 'Yes, Lord.' Then said he unto them, 'Therefore every scribe who hath become a disciple of the kingdom of heaven is like unto a householder, who bringeth forth out of his storehouse both new things and old.'

52. Just as in Mark iv. 25, the 'for' attempts a connection where none really exists, so here W. argues that, in spite of the 'therefore,' 52 has no real connection with 51 or with the parables.

It is by no means an easy saying. μαθητευθεὶς τῇ βασιλείᾳ seems to mean: 'a scribe schooled for the kingdom of heaven.' He is the Christian scribe in contrast to the Jewish scribe. All his learning and training are directed towards, and aim at, the Kingdom. In his teaching he gives out (as a steward gives out his stores) both what is old and what is new. The old is that part of the teaching of Moses and the prophets which is still serviceable and true; the new is the teaching of Jesus about the Kingdom and the methods of its attainment. The religion of Jesus is a combination of old and new. This saying is probably later than Jesus. In opposition to W., Loisy argues that both 51 and 52 were composed by Matthew as a general conclusion to the parables. As to 52 he says: 'We do not expect the Saviour to speak of the scribes of the Kingdom, not because he holds even the name of "scribe" in horror, but because the idea which the word represents is out of harmony with his spirit. Matthew alone assigns to the teachers of the Gospel a name which up to a certain point is applicable to the Christian preachers who continued the work of Jesus, but which was no more suited to the apostles before the death of the Christ than it was to the Saviour himself. The word "initiated" (μαθητευθείς) too does not belong to the language of Jesus, and the idea is scarcely more in accordance with the primitive notion of the Kingdom. For Matthew the Gospel of the Kingdom may be a more or less complicated doctrine, but Jesus does not so conceive it. The "scribe initiated into the Kingdom" is not exactly a man learned about the Kingdom, but a man who has been a disciple of the Kingdom, that is to say, a disciple of the Gospel personified as a teacher of doctrine, or a man who has received instruction for the Kingdom, *i.e.* who has received the knowledge which makes its adepts ripe for the Kingdom of heaven and which introduces them into it. Whatever meaning is preferred, the idea of the apostolic teaching is implied here, and not the message of Jesus.'......'In the same way as the householder uses old and new, so does the Christian scribe; he preaches the Gospel of Jesus, drawing arguments in its favour from the prophecies of the Old Testament, and by this means corroborates the new truths which are more or less identified with the mysteries contained in the parables. The new truths are the principal thing, hence Matthew mentions them first. Although he has no intention of putting himself forward as the type of the Christian scribe as contrasted with the Jewish scribe, it is his own ideal that he has described in this little parable, which is very easy to understand if it is attributed to him, but impossible to explain if it is attributed to Jesus' (*E. S.* I. pp. 789, 791).

53–58. THE REJECTION IN NAZARETH

(*Cp.* Mark vi. 1–6; Luke iv. 16–30)

53 And when Jesus had finished these parables, he departed
54 thence. And he came into his own native city, and he taught
them in their synagogue, insomuch that they were amazed, and
said, 'Whence come to this man this wisdom, and the miracles?
55 Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary?
and his brothers, James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Judas?
56 And are not also his sisters all with us? Whence then come to
57 this man all these things?' And he was a stumbling-block unto
them. But Jesus said unto them, 'A prophet is not without
58 honour, save in his native city, and in his own home.' And he did
not perform many miracles there because of their unbelief.

Matthew has already used and given Mark iv. 35-41 and v. 1-44. So now he passes on to Mark vi. 1-6.

55. In Mark Jesus is himself called the carpenter; here he is said to be 'the son of the carpenter.' S.S. has: 'the son of Joseph,' which is perhaps the original reading.

58. Matthew significantly modifies Mark here. 'Because of their unbelief' Jesus does not perform many miracles: *i.e.* not because he cannot (as in Mark), but as a punishment.

CHAPTER XIV

1–12. Herod, Jesus, and John the Baptist

(*Cp.* Mark vi. 14–29; Luke iii. 19, 20, ix. 7–9)

1 At that time Herod the tetrarch heard of the fame of Jesus,
2 and he said unto his servants, 'This is John the Baptist; he is
risen from the dead; and therefore miraculous powers are active
in him.'

3 For Herod had seized John, and bound him, and put him in
4 prison on account of Herodias, the wife of his brother. For John
5 had said unto him, 'It is not lawful for thee to have her.' And he
would have liked to have put him to death, but he feared the
6 people, because they counted him as a prophet. But upon Herod's
birthday, the daughter of Herodias danced before them, and pleased
7 Herod. Whereupon he promised with an oath to give her what-
8 soever she should ask. And she, being instigated by her mother,
9 said, 'Give me here on a dish the head of John the Baptist.' And
the king was sorry: nevertheless for the oath's sake, and for the
sake of them who sat with him at table, he commanded it to be
10 given her. So he sent, and had John beheaded in the prison.
11 And his head was brought on a dish, and given to the girl: and
12 she brought it to her mother. And his disciples came, and took
away the corpse, and buried it, and went and told Jesus.

Mark vi. 7–13 has been already used. So Matthew now passes to Mark vi. 14–29, which he considerably abbreviates.

5. Note that in Mark it is Herodias who wants to kill John; here it is Antipas himself. And yet in 9 he is 'grieved.'

8. *προβιβασθεῖσα*, 'induced.' One must assume that she anticipated great results from her daughter's dancing.

W.'s notes are again important. In Matthew, though not in Mark, the disciples of John tell Jesus of John's death, and thereby cause him to fly (verse 13). But the execution of John had happened some while before, and is here merely reported as a belated parenthesis. Thus 13 cannot really be the consequence of 3–12. But Matthew's changes are very worthy of notice, when taken by themselves, and apart from their connection. For in Matthew traces still glimmer through of the *old* tradition which was altered by a later redaction in Mark. The fact that the *return* of the apostles is not mentioned in Matthew is significant. The story of their despatch in Mark is an isolated and interpolated section, the combination of which with what follows led to a very artificial connection. A further glimmer of the old tradition is that in Matthew Jesus flees from Herod. The original cause of his flight was not because Herod had killed John; for that had happened some time before. The real reason was that Herod sought to kill *him* (Jesus). Now xiv. 5, applied to John, contradicts the point of 6–10. Hence we may infer that this verse has been brought here from some other place or connection, where the man whom Herod wanted, but feared, to kill was not John, but Jesus. It is a parallel verse to Luke xiii. 31. Matthew may have known the old tradition as well as Luke. He perverted it by attempting to combine it with the interpolated and secondary narrative of Mark.

13–21. FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND

(*Cp.* Mark vi. 31–44; Luke ix. 10–17)

13 Now when Jesus heard of it, he departed thence by boat to a
lonely place, by himself. But when the people heard of it, they
14 followed him on foot from the cities. So when Jesus disembarked,
he saw a great crowd, and he was moved with compassion toward
15 them, and he healed their sick. And when it was evening, the
disciples came to him, saying, 'This is a lonely place, and the hour
is already late; send the people away, that they may go into the
16 villages, and buy themselves food.' But Jesus said unto them,
17 'They need not depart; do ye give them to eat.' But they said
18 unto him, 'We have here only five loaves and two fishes.' He
19 said, 'Bring them hither to me.' And he bade the people sit
down on the grass, and he took the five loaves, and the two fishes,
and looking up to heaven, he said the blessing, and he broke the
loaves, and gave them to his disciples, and the disciples gave them

20 to the people. And they did all eat, and were satisfied; and they
21 took up of the fragments that were over twelve baskets full. And
they that ate were about five thousand men, beside women and
children.

Matthew has to give another motive for Jesus's departure with his disciples to a solitary and desolate spot. For as he had described the despatch of the disciples upon their mission some while ago, he assumes that they have already returned. They are present in chapters xii. and xiii. So he replaces their arrival by the arrival of disciples of John who report to Jesus the death of their master. We have seen that the death of John had probably happened some while before, and that the 'withdrawal' or flight of Jesus took place from another reason. Nevertheless the device provides a means of getting Jesus away to the solitary spot. It may be merely editorial. But it may also, as W. thinks (see above), be the echo of an older, truer tradition, or as Loisy puts it, indicate the influence of a source 'antérieure à Marc, où le départ de Jésus était causé par l'attitude d'Hérode' (*E. S.* I. p. 932).

14. In Mark, Jesus pities the spiritual desolation of the people, and teaches them. In Matthew he, less appositely (for how could they have come all this way?), pities and heals the sick. *Cp.* for the wording ix. 36.

21. The miracle is magnified by the women and children being added to the 5000 men.

22–33. JESUS WALKS ON THE SEA

(*Cp.* Mark vi. 45–52)

22 And straightway Jesus made his disciples get into the boat,
and cross over before him to the other side, while he sent the
23 people away. And when he had sent the people away, he went up
on to the mountain, by himself, to pray. And when the evening
24 was come, he was there alone. But the boat was then already in
the middle of the lake, harassed by the waves: for the wind was
25 against them. And in the fourth watch of the night he came
26 unto them, walking on the lake. But when the disciples saw him
walking on the lake, they were troubled, saying, 'It is a ghost';
27 and they cried out for fear. But straightway Jesus spake unto
28 them, saying, 'Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid.' And

Peter answered him and said, 'Lord, if it be thou, bid me come to
29 thee upon the water.' And he said, 'Come.' So Peter stepped
down from the boat, and walked upon the water, and went towards
30 Jesus. But when he saw the wind, he was afraid; and he began
31 to sink, and he cried out, saying, 'Lord, save me.' And immediately
Jesus stretched out his hand, and took hold of him, and
32 said unto him, 'O man of little faith, why didst thou doubt?' And
33 when they got up into the boat, the wind dropped. Then they
that were in the boat did him reverence, and said, 'Verily thou
art the Son of God.'

25. Jesus apparently intends to enter the boat. In Mark his intention was merely to pass by and exhibit his miraculous powers.

26. For the Greek φάντασμα S.S. has 'demon,' which Merx regards as the original. The alteration was due to feelings of politeness.

28–31. Matthew only.
A fine, if impossible, illustration of the power of faith and the result of doubt. For the striking and exact parallel in Buddhist literature see *First Three Gospels*, pp. 180–182.

28. For 'bid me' the S.S. reads 'allow me,' ἐπίτρεψον. Loisy regards the story as the product of the resurrection legends and emotions. The word ἐδίστασας in 31 may be compared with ἐδίστασαν in xxviii. 17. The verb is only found in these two places in the N.T. 'It is remarkable,' says the commentator, 'that this "débris" of the Galilæan tradition respecting the apparitions of the risen Christ should have found a home in this place in Matthew, just as the story of the miraculous catch of fish has found a place in Luke v. 7' (*E. S.* I. p. 944).

In the same way 23 *seq.* is also interpreted allegorically. 'Jesus had departed from the disciples, and had gone up on to the mountain to pray, even as, later on, he was to leave his followers to ascend into heaven, to go to God. The disciples toiled greatly in their rowing without him and did not reach their goal, just as the primitive Church was wearied and anxious over its destiny, in the midst of the difficulties that it encountered, and waiting for the Saviour who did not come. The disciples, after the Passion and before they had faith in the resurrection, were in the position of a ship deprived of movement in the midst of the waves; but Jesus came to them, and it was really he, although they had believed at first that they were the dupes of their imagination, and had seen a phantom. So is it in the case of the great coming. Jesus seems to have forgotten his faithful, and it might be supposed that he will pass before Peter's ship without seeing it; but this indifference is only apparent; he will come, and there will be peace; he will come upon the clouds, as he walks on the waters' (*E. S.* I. pp. 944–5).

I cannot here enter upon the discussion as to how far these interpretations are justified. *Cp.* the note on Mark vi. 48.

33. In Matthew the disciples are allowed to recognize that the miraculous powers of Jesus imply his Messiahship. (Son of God equals Messiah.) This recognition deprives the scene at Cæsarea Philippi (xvi. 16) of its special importance.

34–36. THE ARRIVAL AT GENNESARET.

(*Cp.* Mark vi. 53–56)

34 And when they had crossed over, they came to land at Genne-
35 saret. And the men of that place recognized him, and they sent
out into all that country round about, and brought unto him all
36 that were sick. And they besought him that they might only
touch the border of his garment: and as many as touched it were
healed.

34. Gennesaret is still in Galilee. The motive which had led Jesus to 'withdraw' (verse 13) is forgotten or ignored.

CHAPTER XV

1-20. WASHING OF HANDS

(*Cp.* Mark vii. 1-23)

1 Then came to Jesus from Jerusalem some scribes and Pharisees,
2 saying, 'Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the
3 elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread.' But
he answered and said unto them, 'Why do ye also transgress the
4 commandment of God because of your tradition? For God commanded, saying, Honour thy father and thy mother: and, He that
5 revileth father or mother, let him die the death. But ye say,
Whosoever sayeth to his father or his mother, That by which thou
mightest have been benefited from me is Corban,'—(that is, an
6 offering,)—'he shall not honour his father or his mother. Thus
have ye made the commandment of God void because of your
7 tradition. Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying,
8 This people honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far
9 from me. And vainly do they worship me, teaching as their
doctrines the commandments of men.'

10 And he called the people unto him, and said unto them, 'Hear
11 and understand: not that which goeth into the mouth maketh a
man unclean; but that which cometh out of the mouth, this
maketh a man unclean.'

12 Then came his disciples, and said unto him, 'Knowest thou
that the Pharisees were offended when they heard this saying?'
13 But he answered and said, 'Every plant, which my heavenly Father
14 hath not planted, shall be rooted up. Let them alone: they are
blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both
15 will fall into the ditch.' Then answered Peter and said unto him,

16 'Explain the parable to us.' And Jesus said, 'Are ye too still
17 without understanding? Do ye not understand, that whatever
entereth into the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into
18 the privy? But those things which issue from the mouth come
19 forth from the heart; and these make a man unclean. For out
of the heart come evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, unchastity,
20 thefts, false witness, blasphemies. These are the things which
make a man unclean: but to eat with unwashed hands doth not
make a man unclean.'

Matthew shortens and systematises. He combines Mark vii. 6–8 with 9–13, and avoids the repetition in 8 and 9. The divineness of the Pentateuchal Law (not merely of the Decalogue, for Exodus xxi. 17 is cited as well as xx. 12) is still more sharply emphasized by the substitution of 'God' for 'Moses' in 4.

3. Merx calls attention to the fact that S.S. has a 'command' where the Greek has παράδοσις. This he thinks is original. For the order to wash the hands before meals was not a tradition; it was comparatively modern. It was only instituted by Hillel and Shammai, and could not have been called a 'tradition.' The point of the argument is: 'Your Rabbinic laws annul God's laws: why then should I observe your laws? You have no right to make laws which bring about a conflict with God's laws.'

5. 'He shall not honour his father': *i.e.* he need not do so; he is relieved of the obligation of honouring his father (by helping him).

11. Matthew makes the implicit and wider statement of Mark explicit and narrower by the addition of 'into' and 'out of the mouth.' But substantially he hits the meaning.

12–14. Matthew only.

Though the verses are editorial, yet it is doubtless true that the Pharisees were 'offended.' As I have explained in the notes on Mark vii., the principle of Jesus is inconsistent with the teaching of the Law. If the Law is perfect and divine, then the principle could not be one or the other.

13. The 'plants' are the Pharisees. S.S. has '*the* Father who is in heaven,' not '*my* Father.' Jesus is made to announce the ruin of the Pharisees and, so we may also suppose, of Pharisaic Judaism.

14. Both the leaders and the followers who believe in them are blind, and in their blindness will suffer a common doom. The second part of the verse is also found substantially in Luke xii. 39, and was doubtless a metaphor used by Jesus, and taken by Matthew from Q, or some other source.

18. This verse puts the point clearly. But the opposition between 'into the mouth' and 'from the mouth' carries the redactor somewhat too far. For what comes 'from the man' (so Mark) is wider than what comes 'from the mouth.' Yet though Matthew throughout presses 'from the mouth' instead of the more general 'from the man,' he includes in his catalogue of sins many which do not literally proceed from the *mouth*, though they do proceed from the *man*.

To eat with unwashed hands is no 'sin of the heart,' and therefore cannot defile.

21–28. THE CANAANITE WOMAN

(*Cp.* Mark vii. 24–30)

21 Then Jesus departed thence, and withdrew to the district of
22 Tyre and Sidon. And, behold, a Canaanite woman came out from
that region, and cried out, saying, 'Pity me, Lord, son of David;
23 my daughter is grievously possessed with a demon.' But he
answered her not a word. And his disciples came and besought
him, saying, 'Send her away; for she keeps crying out behind us.'
24 But he answered and said, 'I am not sent except to the lost sheep
25 of the house of Israel.' Then came she and did him reverence,
26 saying, 'Lord, help me.' But he answered and said, 'It is not
lawful to take the children's bread, and to throw it to the dogs.'
27 And she said, 'Yes, Lord: for also the dogs eat of the morsels
28 which fall from their masters' table.' Then Jesus answered and
said unto her, 'O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even
as thou desirest.' And her daughter was healed from that hour.

In this story Matthew does not, as so often, curtail Mark, but expands him. 23 and 24 are his own contribution to the story. The question, however, presents itself whether this story was not included in Q, and whether Matthew is not here mainly following Q, and whether Mark himself is not dependent upon this source. See the notes on Mark vii. 24–30. B. Weiss (*Quellen*, A, p. 158) strongly advocates this view on perhaps inadequate grounds. Loisy says with more reserve: 'l'histoire de la Cananéenne semble avoir été paraphrasée pour mettre en relief l'objet propre du ministère de Jésus; mais la réponse du Christ à la femme païenne paraît venir directement de la source où Marc lui-même a puisé' (*E. S.* I. p. 130).

22. The woman recognizes and realizes that Jesus is the Messiah, and so proclaims and addresses him. An addendum, the historical character of which is very doubtful. 'It can hardly be unintentional that Matthew omits the statement that Jesus entered into a house in this heathen territory, and represents the woman as coming out of those boundaries (ὁρίων) to Jesus' (Allen). So too Loisy. Matthew could not let Jesus perform a miracle on heathen soil, after having forbidden the disciples (x. 5) to enter it (*E. S.* I. p. 971).

23. 'Send her away': *i.e.* grant her request, and so get rid of her.

'Pour accentuer le miracle,' says Loisy, 'et surtout la foi de la femme, Matthieu suppose que Jésus n'a cédé qu'à une triple requête' (*E. S.* I. p. 977). If Loisy is right, and these verses are editorial, they show wonderful art. Jesus keeps silence. What is passing in his soul? Does he long to break the ordered limitation which, as he believes, keeps his deeds of mercy and healing to the confines of Israel? A struggle may be going on within him. Meanwhile the disciples desire to get rid of the unfortunate and clamorous woman.

24. Then Jesus breaks his silence. His mission is limited to Israel. The words are built up from x. 6. It is not right, I think—it misconceives the situation and the meaning—when Loisy says, 'on dirait qu'il dédaigne d'adresser la parole à la Cananéenne, ne fût-ce que pour lui déclarer qu'elle n'a rien à attendre de lui.' Rather may we take it that the meaning is that he longs to help, but that he feels himself tied by the law of his mission. His disciples shall convert the world; he himself is sent only to Israel.

26. In this reply Matthew may have reproduced the source more accurately than Mark. He does not say that the children are to be fed *first*, thereby allowing that the dogs (*i.e.* the Gentiles) are, at all events, to be fed second. Jesus does not look to the future. He says unconditionally that his help is for the Jews alone.

It is very doubtful whether Wernle is right if he holds that even in verse 26 as elsewhere the secondary character of Matthew's version of the story is shown. He says (*Sources of our knowledge of the life of Jesus,* E. T., p. 84), 'Let the question but be asked, by whom and for what purpose was this story first circulated among the Christians? Assuredly by large-minded disciples, and for the purpose of showing to Gentile Christians that at least once in his life Jesus had pity upon the prayer of a Gentile. For that, and that only, is the original thought at the basis of the story: not the national narrowness of Jesus, but his victory over it in one instance, full of significance for the future. Consequently it is the liberal, wideminded mould, in which Mark casts the story, that corresponds to its original sense, while it is the exaggerated national bigotry of Jesus, wrought up to an artificial climax, in Matthew, that rests on an inferior tradition.' The exclusiveness and bigotry of Jesus, of which Wernle here speaks, are probably in Matthew more apparent than real. What Jesus actually said and did we can no longer know, but Loisy is more probably right when he urges that the object of Matthew's additions is partly to set off the miracle and the faith of the woman, and partly to give the theoretic explanation for a puzzling fact. Jesus says that he has been sent to the lost sheep of Israel only. This looks like a 'narrow' tradition But it is not. It is intended to explain the undoubted but perplexing fact that Jesus, the universal Saviour and Mediator, did actually confine himself to the Jews. The explanation is that God had ordered this limitation. After his resurrection he will send his disciples to all the world.

28. The emphasis upon the woman's faith and Jesus's commendation of it are added and noteworthy features of Matthew. But they are hardly, as B. Weiss thinks, original. Mark hardly omitted them because he thought that Jesus yielded to the woman's request not from her faith in his powers, but from the recognition made by her of the priority of the claims of Israel. Mark vii. 29 is less likely to be 'redactional' than Matt. xv. 28, more especially as the praise of faith is not unfrequent in Matthew; *cp.* viii. 10.

29–31. FRESH HEALINGS

(*Cp.* Mark vii. 31–37)

29 And Jesus departed thence, and came to the lake of Galilee.
30 And he went up on to the mountain, and sat down there. And great crowds came unto him, having with them those that were lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and they cast them
31 down at Jesus's feet; and he healed them: so that the crowd marvelled to see how the dumb spoke, the maimed became sound, the lame walked, and the blind saw: and they glorified the God of Israel.

Instead of the one miracle in Mark vii. 31–37 we have here a sort of general survey. 'Ein Redaktionsstück, eine allgemeine Uebersicht,' W. rightly calls the passage. 'The magical healing of the deaf and dumb man is passed over like the magical healing of the blind man, Mark viii. 22–26. Yet these two objectionable tales have cast their shadow before in Matt. ix. 27–33. That Jesus here ascends the mountain, whither the sick follow him, is odd. The mountain here precedes the desert place (33), whereas in the parallel passage the mountain (xiv. 23) follows on the desert. As 32 &c. follows on 31 without change of scene, it is perhaps possible to identify the mountain with the desert place, especially as ἐρημία has no article. The Aramaic *tura* (mountain) includes the idea of ἐρημία, because the uninhabited parts of Palestine (*das Draussen*) are almost always mountainous' (W.).

32–39. FEEDING OF THE FOUR THOUSAND

(*Cp.* Mark viii. 1–10)

32 Then Jesus called his disciples unto him, and said, 'I feel pity
for the people, because they have tarried with me now three days,
and have nothing to eat: and I do not wish to send them away
33 fasting, lest they faint by the way.' And his disciples said unto
him, 'Whence could we get so much bread in the wilderness, so as
34 to satisfy so great a crowd?' And Jesus said unto them, 'How
many loaves have ye?' And they said, 'Seven, and a few small
36 fishes.' And he bade the people sit down on the ground. And he
took the seven loaves and the fishes, and spoke the blessing, and
broke them, and gave them to his disciples, and the disciples gave
37 them to the people. And they all ate, and were satisfied: and
they took up of the broken bits that were left seven baskets full.
38 And they that ate were four thousand men, beside women and
39 children. Then he sent the people away, and went into the boat,
and came into the district of Magdala.

Matthew keeps pretty close to the version in Mark. As in the feeding of the five thousand he heightens the marvel by adding some children and women, and he makes Jesus arrive at the district of Magadan instead of Dalmanutha, a locality equally unknown to us.

CHAPTER XVI

1–4. A Sign is Refused

(*Cp.* Mark viii. 11–13; Luke xii. 54–56, xi. 29)

1 Then the Pharisees and the Sadducees came, and demanded
2 him to show them a sign from heaven in order to tempt him. But
he answered and said unto them, '[In the evening, ye say, It will
3 be fair weather: for the sky is red. And in the morning, It will
be stormy weather to-day: for the sky is red and overcast. Ye
can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs
4 of the times?] A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after
a sign; and no sign shall be given unto it, except the sign of
Jonah.' And he left them, and departed.

1. Why does Matthew bring in the Sadducees, who in Mark only appear in Jerusalem? The only unstrained reason seems to be W.'s, which is given in the note on 12.

2 and 3 are an awkward adaptation of Luke xii. 54–56, and are wanting in several good MSS. The signs of the times are not the miracles of Jesus, as the inserter of these verses would seem to mean, but important events, indications of the coming *dénouement*, the final Judgment and the end of the existing order of things. To the interpolator they seem to mean the miracles which Jesus had already wrought, and which had left the Jews irresponsive and unbelieving.

4. The sign of Jonah is added from xii. 38, which chapter contains an independent variant of the whole story from Q.

5–12. Bread and Leaven

(*Cp.* Mark viii. 14–21; Luke xii. 1)

5 And the disciples came across to the other side, and forgot to
6 take with them bread. Then Jesus said unto them, 'Take heed and
7 beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.' And
they argued in themselves, saying, 'It is because we have taken no
8 bread.' But Jesus knew their thoughts, and he said unto them,
'O ye of little faith, why argue ye in yourselves, It is because we
9 have brought no bread? Do ye not yet understand, and do ye not
remember the five loaves of the five thousand, and how many
10 baskets ye took up? or the seven loaves of the four thousand, and
11 how many baskets ye took up? How is it that ye do not under-
stand that I spoke not to you concerning bread? But beware of
12 the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.' Then they
understood how that he bade them beware, not of the leaven of
bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.

5. Allen aptly notices that Matthew is careful to make only the disciples the subject of 'they forgot.' The disciples forgot, not Jesus.

6. For Mark's 'leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod' Matthew has 'leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.' Mr Allen observes that 'it is doubtful what Mark intended his readers to understand by the leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod. Possibly the plots of the Pharisees and Herodians to kill Christ. Matthew understood leaven to mean false teaching and therefore substitutes Sadducees for Herod.' So too W., *cp.* verse 12.

7. Mark has *διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους*, which appears to mean that the disciples discussed out loud with each other the meaning of Jesus's warning, and interpreted it to refer to their forgetfulness to take enough bread with them. In any case they discuss out loud. Matthew has *διελογίζοντο ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*, which apparently means a silent pondering or arguing within their own hearts. That Jesus reads their inward thoughts heightens the solemnity of the story.

11. Matthew now deviates from Mark. He makes Jesus definitely say that he was not speaking of material bread when he warned the disciples against the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees. This broad hint is enough for the disciples, and we

are informed in the next verse that they understand what he had meant. But Matthew also appears to interpret 8–10 to mean that Jesus wished the disciples to understand that they need have no care about material bread. He with his miraculous powers would always see that they had enough to eat. This is not probably the original meaning of these verses. See the notes on Mark.

12. Matthew attempts to give the isolated saying in Mark viii. 15 a good connection. He interprets it in a manner which, if W. is right, was not its original signification. As he makes the 'leaven' to be the 'teaching,' not the evil disposition of the Pharisees, he is compelled to change Herod, who did not teach, into Sadducees, whom he regards as teachers.

Note how extremely absurd it is to suppose that the disciples could have conceivably misinterpreted Jesus's bidding (6) in the way they do (7). How far-fetched is Weiss's suggestion on Mark viii. 16, that the disciples perhaps thought that Jesus meant to warn them of poisoned bread with which their enemies might contrive to supply them!

13–28. THE DECLARATION OF MESSIAHSHIP—THE CONDITIONS OF DISCIPLESHIP

(*Cp.* Mark viii. 27–ix. 1; Luke ix. 18–27)

13 Then Jesus came into the district of Cæsarea Philippi. And he asked his disciples, saying, 'Whom do men say that the Son of
14 man is?' And they said, 'Some say John the Baptist: some
15 Elijah; and others Jeremiah, or one of the prophets.' He said
16 unto them, 'But *ye*—whom say ye that I am?' And Simon Peter answered and said, 'Thou art the Messiah, the Son of the living God.'

17 And Jesus answered and said unto him, 'Happy art thou, Simon Bar-jonah: for flesh and blood revealed it not unto thee,
18 but my Father who is in heaven. So I say also unto thee: Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the
19 gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatever thou bindest on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatever thou loosest on earth shall be loosed in heaven.'

20 Then he enjoined his disciples that they should tell no one that he was the Messiah.

21 From that time began Jesus to show unto his disciples, how
that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer much from the elders
and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and on the third day
22 be raised. Then Peter took him aside, and began to rebuke him,
23 saying, 'God forbid, Lord; this shall never befall thee.' But he
turned, and said unto Peter, 'Get thee behind me, Satan: thou
art a stumbling-block unto me: for thou thinkest not the thoughts
of God, but of men.'

24 Then said Jesus unto his disciples, 'If any man would come
after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow
25 me. For whoever would save his life shall lose it: and whoever
26 would lose his life for my sake shall find it. For what shall it
profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and forfeit his life? or
27 what shall a man give as the price of his life? For the Son of
man is about to come in the glory of his Father with his angels;
and then will he render to every man according to his works.
28 Verily I say unto you, There are some of those standing here, who
shall not taste death, till they see the Son of man coming in his
kingdom.'

Matthew omits Mark viii. 22–26. He probably objected to the manner in which the miracle is conducted. It has already been pointed out how both Mark viii. 22–26 and vii. 31–37 have 'cast their shadows before' in Matt. ix. 27–33.

13–16 correspond with Mark viii. 27–29.

13. Note that 'the Son of man' is put instead of Mark's 'I'; in some MSS. it is added to 'I' in apposition. As the 'Son of man' is in Matthew equivalent to the Messiah, the change from the simple 'I' is very awkward, for the question anticipates the reply.

14. Jeremiah is added. Was there also some legend that he too like Elijah had not died? The wording points in the direction of Luke ix. 19: 'a prophet' is being interpreted to mean, 'one of the old prophets resurrected.'

16. 'The Son of the living God' is added. The Messiah is the Son of God, but this is scarcely to be understood yet in a Johannine or full Christian sense.

17–19. Matthew only. This is the famous passage about the primacy of Peter and his position in the Church. Its date can hardly be early. To make up for the rebuke in 23, Peter here receives a magnificent praise and promise.

17. No man has told him, including Jesus himself. Only inward divine revelation could have enabled Peter to make the right guess. But after all that has happened, this is extremely odd. It contradicts xiv. 33. J. Weiss points out that it implies a peculiar Christology. Human sight and judgment could not discern in Jesus, as he walked on earth, the divine Sonship.

18. 'So I': *i.e.* in addition to what God has told you, I now announce, &c.

'Thou art Peter.' It is assumed here that Simon Bar-jonah already possesses the additional name of Peter, *i.e.* Rock, in Aramaic *Kepha*. Peter then is to be the basis, the corner-stone of the Church. Elsewhere (not in the Gospels) Christ himself is so described. It is remarkable that Mr Allen should still put forward the old Protestant interpretation according to which the rock is not Peter, but the Messiahship and divine Sonship of Christ. 'Upon this rock of revealed truth I will build my Church.' Hardly, except by desire, could anyone have hit upon this interpretation of the words.

The word *ἐκκλησία* is in the Gospels only found here, and in Matt. xviii. 17. It corresponds to the Hebrew and Aramaic word *keneset*, and means 'congregation' or 'community.'

This passage could only have been written after the death of Jesus, for the Christian community was hardly founded by Jesus, but only after his death on the basis of his supposed resurrection. As Holtzmann says: 'In the mouth of Jesus the word is an anticipation.' 'Die Verkündigung Jesu galt dem Himmelreich, den Begriff der *ἐκκλησία* dagegen hat Paulus eingeführt (freilich als *ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ* noch nicht *τοῦ Χριστοῦ*) wie auch das Bild vom Bau.' Mr Allen argues that 'there is no difficulty at all in supposing that Christ used some Aramaic phrase or word which would signify the community or society of his disciples, knit together by their belief in His divine Sonship, and pledged to the work of propagating His teaching.' M. Loisy is wonderfully free and critical in his conclusions. He agrees with Holtzmann. Jesus preached the Kingdom only and no substitute for it; if he had spoken of the Church he would not have said 'my Church,' any more than he says 'my Kingdom.' But Peter must have had some prominence or pre-eminence among the disciples even in the lifetime of the Master. Jülicher says, however, that to Matthew the words do not mean a special honour for Peter exclusively. 'Petrus repräsentiert ihm den Apostolat, die apostolische, auf das

Lehramt fest gegründete Kirche' (*Einleitung*, p. 268). This seems doubtful. The writer of the passage is probably not thinking only of Peter, but also of his successors. In them Peter still lives. He lives in a power which is that of the Church itself, yet not merely its diffused authority in the particular churches, but, as Loisy says, a general and distinct authority, which stands to the particular authorities as Peter stood to the disciples and even to Paul.

The powers of binding and loosing given to Peter in this passage are in xviii. 18 given to all the disciples. This is not necessarily, to Matthew, a contradiction. 'These powers belong in a certain sense to all the disciples, who, for the Evangelist, do not represent the mass of the faithful, but their leaders, the Church not exercising directly, as a collective body, the powers in question, but only exercising them by means of the men who govern it, the overseers and elders, in whom Matthew certainly recognizes the successors, or at least the delegates, of the apostles; and these powers belong especially to Simon, because Simon is Peter, and, in so far as a principal centre of authority exists in the Church, he presides over the life and order of that institution. It would be equally arbitrary to maintain, taking these texts as a basis, that Matthew knows in the Church no other authority than that of Peter, as to assert, in spite of the texts, that he attributes to Peter no authority which does not belong *by the same right* to the other apostles. The Twelve, that is to say, the presidents of the different communities, have the same powers; but Peter only, that is to say, the presidents of the community which represents the tradition of Peter, possesses them in virtue of his headship, by a kind of universal episcopate' (*E. S.* II. p. 11).

The gates of hell are a metaphor for the greatest dangers, as in the Psalms. The community will not succumb to persecutions. M. Loisy gives a more literal explanation. The powers of darkness and of death will never prevail over the Church of Christ, which is eternal. 'In reality the Christian community is always presupposed in the discourses in Matthew, even if it is not called by that name. For under the title of the Kingdom of God, the community, though from a somewhat special point of view, is implied' (W.).

19. Peter is given here a double office. He is the Rabbi who 'binds and looses,' and he is the steward or majordomo. It is as the steward that he bears the keys. The keys of the Kingdom are the signs of office. The basis of this part of the verse is Isaiah xxii. 15-25. (In the Apocalypse iii. 7 Jesus himself holds the keys.) Thus Peter, as majordomo or steward, is to occupy the

same position towards the 'Kingdom' as Eliakim occupied towards the house of David in Isaiah. He is to be the first minister, the chief officer, with full powers.

The ordinary interpretation according to which Peter is the gatekeeper of heaven is false. It is not 'heaven' but 'the Kingdom of heaven' of which he has the 'keys,' and that is a very different thing. The keys symbolize the office. They need not be used. So W. But M. Loisy takes a somewhat different view. A chief duty of the majordomo is to grant or refuse access to the royal presence. Hence the keys symbolize 'the power of receiving into the Church those who wish to enter, of keeping out those who would cause trouble, and generally, every exercise of ecclesiastical authority towards men' (*E. S.* II. p. 11). The use of the keys implied in Rev. iii. 7 suggests that this interpretation is more probably correct.

'Heaven' in the second part of the verse is, of course, quite different from 'the Kingdom of heaven' in the first part. The 'Kingdom of heaven' is here practically the same thing as the Christian community. 'Heaven' by itself is the dwelling-place of God, as opposed to earth.

'Whatever thou bindest.' Here the second office allotted to Peter is alluded to. He is not only the steward, but the Rabbi, and therefore the judge. We can illustrate the passage by a reference to Matt. xiii. 52. There the scribe is compared with the steward; here the two are combined.

Binding and loosing mean in Jewish jurisprudence forbidding and allowing. What Peter on earth declares right and wrong, allowed and forbidden, is to be ratified in heaven. M. Loisy thinks, not unjustly, that a larger sense must be given to these words here. Laws regarding the discipline of the Church, and specially the remission of sins, are included. Peter would have the power to exclude sinners from the Church, and to allow the repentant to enter it again (*E. S.* II. p. 12). For the terminology see also Additional Note 46.

Both metaphors give great power to Peter, and by Peter can only be meant Peter's successors. For if the passage was not spoken by Jesus, or even written in Peter's lifetime, what can it mean but to imply that the authority given to Peter is to be continued and to remain vested in Peter's successors and representatives? How oddly different the passage sounds from utterances like those in Mark ix. 35, x. 44! It is, as M. Loisy says, an 'enclave' in Mark's story. It belongs to the last stratum of the editorial process which produced the 'first Gospel.' Though not an authentic utterance of Jesus, it is none the less a truthful interpretation of real facts in the history of the Church.

20 corresponds with Mark viii. 30.

21. The corresponding verse of Mark (31) is emphasized, and the journey to Jerusalem is specially mentioned. Matthew indicates here, from his use of the same words as in iv. 17, 'from that time began Jesus,' that here begins the second great division in the life of Jesus. The preaching in Galilee is ended. Now come the journey to the capital, the Passion and the death. See Carpenter, *First Three Gospels*, p. 279.

It is to be noted that for the last words of Mark viii. 31 (καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι) *both* Matthew and Luke have καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι. How is this identity to be explained? Not in all probability in the use of Matthew by Luke or of Luke by Matthew. B. Weiss adopts an explanation here which he also adopts in some other instances of this kind, and a very doubtful explanation it is. He says one must assume that Jesus's prediction that he would rise 'after three days' (which, according to Weiss, means merely 'after a very short time') was changed in the oral tradition to 'on the third day,' just because Jesus did not remain three days in the grave, but rose 'on the third day.' But though the compiler of Matthew did not know Luke, and *vice versâ*, the text of the one may have been occasionally altered in accordance with the other. Again, some MSS. and the S.S. read in both Matthew and Luke here 'after three days,' which may be the primitive reading. And lastly it is by no means certain and is indeed unlikely that 'after three days' meant originally 'in a short time,' or that it is older than 'on the third day,' or even that 'after three days' and 'on the third day' may not be used indifferently with the same meaning. *Cp.* W. on Mark viii. 31 and *E. S.* II. p. 17, n. 1. The common use of ἐγερθῆναι may be due to chance, or to conflation.

23. σκάνδαλον εἶ ἐμοῦ is added by Matthew. Peter is a stumbling-block or temptation to Jesus, because he implies that Jesus ought not to go up to Jerusalem to suffer and die, but to triumph and conquer as the 'Jewish' and 'political' Messiah.

24. Jesus in Matthew speaks the passage (24–28) more properly to the disciples only. In Mark (viii. 34–ix. 1) he summons and addresses the 'crowd.' See notes on Mark.

27 corresponds with Mark viii. 38, but is shortened because part of Mark viii. 38 had been practically quoted already in Matt. x. 33 (Q).

Jesus is not afraid to announce a judgment according to works. Prov. xxiv. 12 *fin.* is not antiquated.

28. *Cp.* Mark ix. 1. The Son of man brings his Kingdom with him at the Parousia. He ushers it in and represents it. In the older conception the Kingdom is God's. Here it is the Messiah's. *Cp.* xiii. 41.

The Greek 'in' may perhaps be translated 'with,' for it is itself a translation of an Aramaic particle that meant either 'with' or 'in.' 'In' makes much less good and simple sense.

CHAPTER XVII

1–13. The Transfiguration

(*Cp.* Mark ix. 2–13; Luke ix. 28–36)

1 And after six days Jesus took Peter, James, and John his
brother, and brought them up on to an high mountain by them-
2 selves. And he was transfigured before them: and his face shone as
3 the sun, and his raiment became white as the light. And, behold,
there appeared unto them Moses and Elijah talking with him.
4 Then Peter answered and said unto Jesus, 'Lord, it is good for us
to be here: if thou wilt, I will make here three tents; one for
5 thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah.' While he yet spoke,
behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold, a voice
out of the cloud, saying, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am
6 well pleased; hear ye him.' And when the disciples heard it,
7 they fell upon their faces, and were sore afraid. And Jesus came
8 and touched them, and said, 'Arise, and be not afraid.' And when
they had lifted up their eyes, they saw nobody except Jesus only.

9 And as they came down from the mountain, Jesus enjoined
them, saying, 'Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man hath
risen again from the dead.'

10 And the disciples asked him, saying, 'Why then say the
11 scribes that Elijah must first come?' And Jesus answered and
said unto them, 'Elijah cometh and putteth all things in order.
12 But I say unto you, Elijah hath come already, and they did
not recognize him, but they did unto him whatever they pleased.
13 So also is the Son of man about to suffer from them.' Then
the disciples understood that he spoke unto them of John the
Baptist.

1–8 correspond pretty closely with Mark ix. 2–8. 7 (which is a human and characteristic touch) is, however, wanting in Mark and in Luke as well as 6.

5. The cloud which 'overshadows' is 'bright.' Thus 'overshadow' has lost its original literal meaning, and merely represents the presence or coming down of God.

10 corresponds with Mark ix. 11. But the question of the disciples as here put may possibly mean, Why do the Scribes say that Elijah must come before the advent of the Messiah? He has only *now* appeared (*i.e. after* the coming of Messiah, just now at the transfiguration).

Of the two replies of Jesus in Mark ix. 12, 13, Matthew preserves the second only. And further: John (=Elijah) was a type of the Messiah, who is also about to be rejected, to suffer and to die. But 12 *b*, according to Völter, is no true continuation of 12 *a*. *Cp.* the note on Mark ix. 12. Matthew already found the interpolation about the Son of man in his copy of Mark, but he also knew (a complicated theory!) an older redaction in which it was wanting. He inserts the interpolation indeed, but puts it in a place, where, though awkward and interrupting, it seemed to him less in the way than in the place where it had been inserted in Mark. M. Loisy thinks that Matthew perhaps means to distinguish two comings of Elijah, 'l'un qui est affaire d'exégèse typologique, et qui est arrivé par Jean-Baptiste, l'autre, qui est l'objet propre des prophéties, à la fin des temps. C'est pourquoi il dit qu'Élie remettra tout en ordre, et ne dit pas que les Écritures aient eu leur accomplissement dans l'histoire de Jean' (*E. S.* II. p. 44).

13. The disciples are allowed to understand the meaning of what Jesus says. In Mark it is implied, if not stated, that they remain obtuse.

14–21. AN EPILEPTIC CHILD

(*Cp.* Mark ix. 14–29; Luke ix. 37–43, xvii. 5, 6)

14 And when they returned to the people, a man came up and
15 knelt down before him saying, 'Lord, have pity on my son: for
he is moonstruck and suffers sorely: for often he falls into the
16 fire, and often into the water. And I brought him to thy dis-
17 ciples, and they could not cure him.' Then Jesus answered and

said, 'O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I bear with you? bring him hither to
18 me.' And Jesus rebuked the demon; and it departed out of him: and the child was cured from that hour.

19 Then came the disciples to Jesus privately, and said, 'Why
20 could not *we* cast it out?' And Jesus said unto them, 'Because of your little faith: for verily I say unto you, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye could say unto this mountain, Move from this place to that, and it would move; and nothing would be impossible unto you.'

The narrative in Mark is considerably shortened. It may even be that Matthew here depends on another source as well as on Mark. B. Weiss argues that both transfiguration and epileptic child stood in Q, but this is certainly not proved as regards the former and is doubtful as regards the latter. Weiss thinks that in Q the child was not supposed to be possessed by a demon; epilepsy was to Q a mere disease, such as the disciples, who had received a commission to heal diseases, might have been expected to cure. Loisy thinks that in his abbreviation of Mark's narrative, Matthew may have used Mark's source. And perhaps 'cette source donnait-elle comme épilogue à l'histoire de l'épileptique la leçon de la foi ainsi que la présente Matthieu' (*E. S.* I. p. 131).

15. This is the original of the famous words, 'Kyrie eleison,' 'O Lord, have pity.'

20. Instead of Mark ix. 29, Matthew substitutes Mark xi. 22, 23. The disciples' lack of success is attributed to their lack of faith. The illustration may be regarded as an illustration only, and yet the speaker must be supposed to believe that physical miracles are possible for man to achieve, if only he fully believes and trusts that he *can* through faith achieve them. *Cp.* xxi. 21, where the thought and illustration are repeated. S.S. has 'unfaith,' ἀπιστία, for 'little faith,' which Merx thinks is original. 'No faith' seemed too strong to be attributed to the apostles, so 'little faith' was substituted. Again, S.S. has: 'If there were in you faith' (which ye have not), 'then,' &c. This would be in Greek εἰ εἴχετε, 'If ye had faith' (which you have not). The present reading, εἰ ἔχητε, 'If ye' (which may be the case) 'have faith,'—again a softening down. Against this view, *cp. E. S.* II. p. 58, n. 2.

21 is wanting in the best MSS., and may be regarded as 'not genuine.' Nevertheless, it shows the value attributed to fasting at

an early period of the Christian Church. Moreover the addition of 'and fasting' in Mark ix. 29 has good authority (S.S. &c.), and is now accepted by W. in the second edition of his commentary on Mark.

22, 23. SECOND PREDICTION OF THE PASSION AND RESURRECTION

(*Cp.* Mark ix. 30–32; Luke ix. 43–45)

22 And while they were journeying in Galilee, Jesus said unto
them, 'The Son of man is about to be delivered up into the
23 hands of men: and they will kill him, and on the third day he
will rise.' And they were exceedingly grieved.

The disciples understand what Jesus meant, and, indeed, his words are clear. Matthew does not maintain, like Mark, an absurd degree of obtuseness in the disciples. The sufferer is the Son of man; and here Matthew does not, as in xvi. 21, substitute the personal pronoun. The Son of man is intended to signify Jesus; but the question remains why Jesus spoke of himself, if so he did, under this title, and especially on these occasions.

24–27. ON TEMPLE TRIBUTE

(Matthew only)

24 And when they came to Capernaum, they who collected the
temple tax came to Peter, and said, 'Does not your master pay
25 the tax?' He said, 'Yes.' And when he had come into the
house, Jesus anticipated him, saying, 'What thinkest thou,
Simon? from whom do the kings of the earth collect toll or
26 tax? From their own children, or from strangers?' Peter said
unto him, 'From strangers.' Jesus said unto him, 'Then are the
27 children free. Yet, so that we give them no offence, go thou to
the lake, and throw out thy line, and take up the fish that first
comes up; open its mouth, and thou wilt find therein a coin; that
take, and give it unto them for me and thee.'

The passage only occurs in Matthew. The tax referred to is the Jewish tax of two drachmai (= half a shekel), paid by every Jew while the Temple was in existence towards its upkeep. It was collected about March in every year. The story again gives prominence to Peter, as in xiv. 28–31 and xvi. 17–19.

25. τέλη, 'toll'; κῆνσος, 'tax.' Both, according to Oriental conception, are to be levied on, and exacted from, the foreigner and the tributary only. But, if so, and if the 'king' in this case is God as the Lord of the Temple, no Jew ought to pay the tax. The argument is really too wide. All the citizens of the theocracy should be exempt from toll or tax. But M. Loisy appears to think that Jesus might have taken the line that those who would not believe in him are no longer 'sons' and 'free.' And this distinction between the sons of the Kingdom and the subjects of the Law is, he thinks, more in accordance with the views of Jesus about the Kingdom than with the position of the early Christian community towards Jewish legalism. Hence it is, so far, an argument for the authenticity of the story.

We must therefore suppose that Jesus is not thinking of the Jews, but of himself and his disciples. He and they are sons of the Kingdom, and therefore should be free of taxes.

But the tax depended upon a Pentateuchal law (Ex. xxx. 11–16). Would Jesus have wished to disobey it, or suggested that it had been wrongly imposed? Mr Allen raises the same doubt.

Is Holtzmann right in saying: 'Innerlich weiss er als Messias sich nicht gebunden an den bestehenden Cultus'?

He never definitely says that the Law was only to continue till his own appearance, or that he did not believe that God had ordered every enactment in it, or that God had told him, the Messiah, that he might violate it. It is not certain that he was definitely hostile to the sacrificial system. He wanted the Temple to be respected. Perhaps the bearing of his words upon the law in the Pentateuch was not present to his mind. We must remember, as Mr Carpenter says, the extreme fragmentariness of the Gospel narratives. Are we to suppose that Jesus had secret views about the Law which he did not dare to mention to the disciples or to the people? Certainly the people loved the Law too well, and were too ready to die for it, to have tolerated any open disparagement of its excellence, validity, or divineness.

It is quite possible that what Jesus actually said upon this occasion has not been accurately preserved.

W. thinks the story must have grown up before the destruction of the Temple. But as the half-shekel tax, after the destruction of the Temple, was added to the taxes which had to be paid to the Romans, this view does not seem to be absolutely necessary. Holtzmann points out that Suetonius says that under Domitian, in whose reign Matthew's Gospel was probably written, the Jewish taxes were very strictly exacted. It has, therefore, been supposed by some (*e.g.* J. Weiss) that the payment to the Romans is the real subject of the story. The Christians, as 'sons of God,' ought not really to have to pay this tax, which was originally a tax paid to God; still they had better pay it, in order to give no offence (not to the Jews, but) to the heathen. The question whether the Christians should pay the tax is answered by a story as to whether Jesus had paid the Temple tax of his own day. Though he was 'free,' he paid it. His concession to the Law is to be typical for the Christian as regards the tax to the Romans. Thus the story, though the fact that Jesus paid the tax may be true, probably grew up only after his death. M. Loisy thinks the story is probably authentic. Luke and Mark may not have cared to include it. He goes so far as to say: 'L'anecdote du didrachme et du poisson semble présenter plus de garanties que la plupart des récits propres au premier Évangile: sauf le trait singulier du miracle, on peut croire que cette anecdote ne vient pas seulement d'une tradition orale assez sûre, mais d'une des sources primitives de l'histoire Évangelique' (*E. S.* I. p. 131). This seems doubtful.

27. The miracle of the fish is rather unpleasing to commentators. Holtzmann says it is meant metaphorically. The tax can easily be paid by a little work; if your trade is fishing, by fishing. This seems doubtful. The *narrator*, at any rate, clearly intends, as Weiss says, to indicate a providential arrangement which Jesus foresaw. It is, however, noteworthy that the story is not completed; the order is given by Jesus, but we are not told how Peter carried it out. This omission may be taken as an argument in favour of an unmiraculous interpretation. Jesus may have said to Peter: 'Go and fish, and with the proceeds of what you catch pay the tax for yourself and for me' (one stater equals four drachmai). This simple order may have been turned into what we now read, but the legend is only in *process* of formation, as the *dénouement* is omitted. Holtzmann calls it a 'Beispiel einer halbausgewachsenen, in ihrer schriftlichen Ausgestaltung auf halbem Wege stehen gebliebenen, Sagenbildung.' Yet it is not quite easy to see how, on the basis of the suggested interpretation ('the tax can easily be paid for by the proceeds of your fishing'), the story of the miracle could have grown up. W. says the story is merely meant to emphasize in a pictorial form that Jesus himself had no money. This, too, seems doubtful.

The principle of not giving needless offence is an important one, and used with great power and insight by Paul.

CHAPTER XVIII

1–9. THE QUESTION OF SUPERIORITY—OF STUMBLING-BLOCKS (*Cp.* Mark ix. 33–37, 42–48; Luke ix. 46–48, xvii. 1, 2)

1 At that time the disciples came unto Jesus, saying, 'Who is
2 the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?' And Jesus called a
3 little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them. And he said, 'Verily I say unto you, Except ye turn, and become as little
4 children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whoever then shall humble himself as this little child, he is greatest
5 in the kingdom of heaven. And whoever receiveth one such little
6 child in my name receiveth me. But whoever causeth one of these little ones who believe in me to stumble, it were better for him that a millstone were hung about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.

7 'Woe unto the world because of the stumbling-blocks! for the stumbling-blocks must needs come; but woe to the man by
8 whom the stumbling-block cometh! But if thy hand or thy foot cause thee to stumble, cut it off, and throw it away from thee: it is better for thee to enter into Life maimed or lame, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire.
9 And if thine eye cause thee to stumble, pluck it out, and throw it away from thee: it is better for thee to enter into Life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire.

Matthew still follows the order of Mark, and uses him as his main authority. In this section, however, he is also, at least in 6–9, dependent upon Q. The incident recorded in Mark ix. 38–41, about the man who expelled demons in the name of Christ, is omitted, perhaps, according to Loisy, because the passage as to

Jewish exorcisms is regarded as an adequate equivalent (xii. 27, 28). xviii. 1–5 corresponds with Mark ix. 33–37. The obviously authentic saying that among the disciples of Jesus, and in the Kingdom, the servant of all is the greatest of all is constantly appearing and reappearing in the Gospels. Thus in addition to the present passage and its parallel in Mark, we have Matt. xx. 26, 27; Luke ix. 48, xxii. 26; Mark x. 43, 44. According to B. Weiss we must assume a 'Rangstreit' story in Q as well as in Mark, and the text of it is preserved in Luke xxii. 24–27 and in Matt. xviii. 2, 3; xxiii. 8–11 (*Quellen*, A, pp. 119–124; B, pp. 67, 68). Weiss supposes that Mark's double use of the child story is due to his having in the one case used his Petrine tradition, in the other case the text of Q. This theory is however unlikely. See below.

1. Matthew is probably right in making the disciples ask Jesus the question 'who is greatest,' instead of Mark's supernatural manner of starting the subject. But he does not indicate that what the disciples wanted to know was which of *themselves* would be the greatest. Perhaps we may assume that Jesus overheard them disputing with one another. Mr Allen has called special attention to the fact that Matthew omits many questions put by Jesus in Mark, just as he also omits phrases which seem to ascribe inability to Jesus or even desire which was not fulfilled. He also likes to omit disputes among the disciples. Rebukes addressed to them are softened. Statements that they did not understand or know what to say are passed over. It is expressly stated that they did understand, xvi. 12, xvii. 13.

The addition 'in the Kingdom of heaven' is not found in Mark. Note the present tense. Hence it might be supposed that the Kingdom has already begun. But this is hardly justified by the tenor of Jesus's reply. The present tense seems loosely used.

2. The child is differently treated here from Mark ix. 36. The application made of it is like Mark x. 15. Only the pure in heart, the trustful, the humble, and the unassuming shall enter the Kingdom. In Matthew, Jesus at once uses the illustration of the child. Mark ix. 35 is omitted. It is used in xxiii. 11. The participle προσκαλεσάμενος replaces Mark's ἐναγκαλισάμενος, for Jesus, in Matthew, is not allowed to embrace the children, and it also usefully indicates that the child had to be summoned. The argument seems to be: 'You talk about who is to be first and greatest in the Kingdom. But unless you are humble, like a child, you will not enter the Kingdom at all. He who does so humble himself shall not only enter the Kingdom, but be the

greatest in it.' But in truth this use of the child cannot be primitive and therefore we may rightly think that the views of B. Weiss as to the 'Rangstreit' having taken this form in Q cannot be accurate. The child is used in 5 for a totally different purpose than in 3; here Matthew more closely follows Mark. In 3 Matthew reproduces Mark x. 15 which he has to omit in xix. 13–15. But in that section it is much more in place. For the child is not necessarily a model of humility. Loisy says rightly: 'In bringing children forward here as models, the redactor of the first Gospel forgets that humility is not a characteristic virtue of their age, and that if the recommendation to accept the proclamation of the Kingdom with the simplicity of children is very natural, one cannot say as much of the exhortation to imitate their humility. The disciples are called upon to be in spirit and from feeling what children are in reality and from position, that is to say "little ones." The idea is in keeping with the Gospel, but the manner of propounding it is artificial and is probably of less primitive origin' (*E. S.* II. 71).

3. στραφῆτε, 'return' in the Biblical and Rabbinical sense of 'repent.' Jesus demands a kind of moral and religious regeneration. One begins again with a child's simplicity.

4 contains the answer to the question in 1. He who is most humble and lowly, and thinks least of himself, shall in the Kingdom be thought the greatest. *Cp.* Matt. xx. 26, 27 and xxiii. 11, 12.

5 corresponds with Mark ix. 37. The child seems here intended to be symbolical of lowly, humble, and insignificant believers or would-be believers. The following verse makes this interpretation tolerably sure.

6–9. We now have the section on stumbling-blocks, which corresponds with Mark ix. 42–48. Verses 8, 9 have already appeared in the Sermon on the Mount, v. 29, 30. Both Mark and Matthew, as Loisy thinks, depend on Q, and the extra verse (7) in Matthew which does not appear in Mark, but has its parallel in Luke (xvii. 1), goes back substantially to the same source.

6 corresponds with Mark ix. 42. The 'believers' are here specially qualified as 'believers in me,' the Christ, 'façon de parler absolument inusitée dans la bouche du Christ historique' (*E. S.* II. p. 78).

7 is not in Mark (*cp.* Luke xvii. 1). The sentence is remarkable. Does it allude to incidents in the Christian Community

which happened after the death of Jesus? Mr Carpenter says that the verse may well go back to Jesus himself. For he must have had plenty of experience of back-sliding even after a few months of his ministry. Because apostasies are certain to occur, blame none the less attaches to those through whose conduct (whether it be uncharitableness, contempt, or indifference) such apostasies arise.

8, 9 correspond with Mark ix. 43-48. They are also found in Matt. v. 29, 30. Here they interrupt the connection. The stumbling-blocks spoken of are a totally different kind from those in 6 and 7. There the reference is to the seduction or lapse of others; here to personal fall and personal temptations.

10-14. The Saving of the Lost

(*Cp.* Luke xv. 3-7)

10 'Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for
I say unto you, that their angels in heaven always behold the
12 face of my Father who is in heaven. What think ye? if a man
have an hundred sheep, and one of them goeth astray, doth he
not leave the ninety and nine upon the mountains, and go and
13 seek the one which hath gone astray? And if so be that he find
it, verily I say unto you, he rejoiceth more over that one sheep,
14 than over the ninety and nine which went not astray. Even so it
is not the will of your Father who is in heaven, that one of these
little ones should perish.

Matthew apparently thought it desirable to introduce in this connection the parable of the lost sheep, in order to indicate the great value which God sets upon the humble believer and upon his salvation. He connects the parable with 6-9 by means of 10, 11, which Loisy calls a combination 'no less subtle than unsuccessful' (*E. S.* I. p. 131).

10. The injunction not to despise one of these little ones must surely refer not to children, but to the humble believers. Yet the second half of the verse about the angels probably related originally to real children, 'little ones' in age and stature. (Mr Allen, with less likelihood, thinks that both here and in verse 6 Matthew was only thinking of real children.)

The statement in the second half of the verse rests upon the idea that individuals (as well as nations) have their guardian angels. Was the original meaning that the angels of children stand nearer to God, inasmuch as children are more precious to Him? In its present connection the verse asserts that those who are lowly and insignificant in the eyes of men are specially precious in the eyes of God. 'To see God's face continually' is a metaphor taken from Oriental court ceremony. Those most intimate with, and honoured by, the king have constant, unimpeded access to his presence (*cp.* Luke i. 19; 2 Kings xxv. 19).

The love of Jesus for children must have been a historic and characteristic trait. He must have been one of the most sympathetic and human of men.

11 has been inserted to make the connection better between 10 and 12. It comes from Luke xix. 10.

12–14. The parable is found in a better connection and with a more original meaning in Luke. For there the words have to do with the repentance of sinners, the desire which God has that none of His human children, however erring or despised, should go permanently astray; here they are used with a special reference to the humble believers of verse 6. They are gentler and more forgiving in tone than xviii. 17, which contemplates the 'loss' of a recalcitrant and obstinate sinner with some equanimity. The 'little ones' of 14 are the same as the 'little ones' of 10 and 6. Verse 14 seems mainly the work of the Evangelist to make the end of the parable fit in with its application and with the wording of 6 and 10*a*. The source of the parable may be Q.

The honour paid to repentance, the desire shown by God that man should repent, God's willingness to receive the penitent, are all characteristic features of the Rabbinical religion. What is new and striking in the teaching of Jesus is that this process of repentance takes an *active* turn. Man is bidden not merely to receive the penitent gladly, but to *seek out* the sinner, to try to redeem him, and *make* him penitent.

15–20. DUTIES AND RIGHTS OF THE COMMUNITY

(Matthew only; but *cp.* Luke xvii. 3)

15 'But if thy brother have sinned, go and reprove him between
thee and him alone: if he hearken to thee, thou hast gained thy
16 brother. But if he hearken not, take with thee one or two more,
that by the mouth of two or three witnesses every matter may be
17 established. And if he refuse to hearken unto them, tell it unto
the church: but if he refuse to hearken even unto the church, let

18 him be unto thee as an heathen and a tax-collector. Verily I say
unto you, Whatever ye bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and
19 whatever ye loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Further-
more I say unto you, If two of you on earth shall agree about
any thing that they ask, it shall be given them from my Father
20 who is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together
in my name, I am in the midst of them.'

15–20 is not found in Mark. But as Matt. xviii. 6, 7 has its parallel in Luke xvii. 1, 2, so xviii. 15 in Luke xvii. 3. A comparison with Luke shows that a short sentence in Q about the erring brother (Luke xvii. 3) was probably expanded by Matthew into 15–20. That sentence was followed by the saying about forgiveness (Luke xvii. 4) out of which Matthew has made a little scene with Peter, and has appended to it the parable of the ungrateful servant. This is a general view, but Harnack persists that Matthew is more original in 15 and 21, 22 than Luke in xvii. 3, 4. The two passages in Matthew are separate and independent. Luke has combined them. Loisy thinks that the expansion of Luke xvii. 3, though superadded to the source, may have been the work of Christian tradition rather than of the Evangelist himself. The parable of the ungrateful servant (23–35) is probably taken from Q, where it also followed on the saying about pardon even as it now does in Matthew (*E. S.* I. p. 132).

15. In verse 6 the duty of preventing any humble believer from falling away or from sinning had been dwelt upon. The humblest believer (or would-be believer?) is not to be neglected or despised. For it is not God's will or wish that any should perish. Now Matthew passes on to describe the right conduct of disciples of Christ to those who *have* stumbled on their way, to those who *have* erred. Great patience is to be shown with the erring. (What sorts of errors are alluded to? Probably those which are connected with specifically Christian conduct or Christian faith.) The usual text has 'sin against thee,' but the parallel in Luke xvii. 3, as well as general reasons, lead one to think that some MSS. are right in omitting 'against thee.' It is not a question of forgiveness of personal injury. On the other hand, as S.S. has 'against thee,' Merx strongly defends it.

An attempt is first to be made to bring back the erring brother to the right path by reprimanding him privately. One person only is to be sent to reprove him. *Cp.* Lev. xix. 17. If that fails, a fresh attempt is to be made in the presence of two witnesses, according to the rule of Deut. xix. 15. If that fails, the congregation must be informed, and if the sinner is still recalcitrant, he is to be abandoned to his fate. Does this mean excommunication? At any rate it means exclusion from the community.

We have in these verses, as Holtzmann says, a piece of ancient Christian law ('ein Stück ältester Gemeindeordnung') put into the mouth of Jesus. 17 is scarcely consistent with 22, and Jesus would hardly have spoken so harshly of the 'tax-collector.' 'The "Church," whose authority may be invoked, is very different from the Master's "Kingdom of God"; and the rejection of the unrepentant evildoer on to the level of the heathen and the publican hardly savours of the tireless love which came to seek and to save the lost....The practice of the later community seeks shelter under the Founder's sanction' (*First Three Gospels*, p. 52). Loisy says not unjustly: 'The obligation upon the individuals no longer to regard *him* as a brother whom the community refuses any longer to count as one of its members is dictated by the interests of social morality in an already organised community: the Christian is not thereby dispensed from forgiving anybody who has committed a personal injury against him. In the Gospel as Jesus preached it, sin was looked at as an individual act, which only wrongs individuals; as God pardons sins, so man, so far as the sin has hurt him personally, must forgive it also; in the community which the Evangelist is thinking of, sin is not only a wrong against God, and capable of causing injury to individual men, but it is also a malefaction (*un attentat*) against the society of the saints, and it must be got rid of, whether by the repentance of the evildoer or by his elimination and removal' (*E. S.* II. p. 89).

18. *Cp.* xvi. 17–20. The right or power there assigned to Peter is here given to the congregation or community as a whole. This version is the older. But M. Loisy thinks that the people intended by 'you' in this verse are the apostles, or rather, those who, when the Evangelist wrote, had replaced them. He says: 'Protestant exegesis makes great efforts to attribute this power to the community, and not to the apostles as such. But, apart from the fact that the parallelism of this sentence with the words that Jesus addressed to Peter contradicts this hypothesis, the nature of the case does not countenance it, as a group of persons without a head cannot be supposed to be invested with judicial power; and the Evangelist, who had no thought of formulating a theory on the seat of authority in the Church, had in view the organization of communities as it existed in his time, in which the paternal authority of bishops and presbyters had been substituted for that of the apostles' (*E. S.* II. p. 91).

'Binding and loosing' must be understood here precisely as in xvi. 19. Its meaning is equally large. It includes a full judiciary and disciplinal power, conferred on and exercised by the chiefs of the community.

It is usually said that 'church' (in verse 17) means here each individual congregation; while in xvi. 18 it means the Christian community as a whole. W. is perhaps right in denying that this difference was intended by Matthew; he means in both cases the mother congregation of Jerusalem. 'For Matthew the congregation, the Church, is the highest disciplinary court of resort, the dispenser of all heavenly blessings; it is already laid down who is to rule in it, who is to give laws; in its fundamental principles the oldest Catholicism is already there' (Jülicher, *Einleitung*, p. 265).

19 is scarcely connected with 18 by more than the verbal coincidences of 'on earth' and 'in heaven.' 'When two or three disciples combine for common prayer in the name of Jesus, they will be heard, because Jesus is present where men assemble together in his name. These assemblies are the reunions of the first Christian communities: they did not exist while Jesus was preaching' (*E. S.* II. p. 92).

20. The continued presence of Jesus in his community is the guarantee that their requests will be granted by God.

The assertion in this verse could only have been made by some one who believed that he was a divine, though not necessarily the divine, being. For such a continued and mystical presence could hardly be claimed by or asserted of any *man*. If, therefore, Jesus said this verse, he must have believed himself to be such a being. Most probably he did not say it. As W. says, he speaks in it as if he were already in heaven. Assemblies of persons praying together in the name of Jesus did not exist while he was alive. Yet these words, as Loisy says, have considerable significance regarded as an expression of the Christian conscience. 'Car le décousu de la rédaction donne à supposer que l'Évangeliste groupe des pensées qui avaient cours autour de lui, et qui, conçues peut-être d'abord par des prophètes chrétiens, étaient adoptées comme formule de la foi commune' (*E. S.* II. p. 92).

The idea of the continued and mystic presence of Jesus in his community is adapted and borrowed from the Jewish idea of the presence of God in Israel. *Cp.* Joel ii. 27, and other passages. Also the maxim in the *Sayings of the Fathers*, 'If two sit together and exchange words of Torah, the divine presence abides between them; and even when a single individual occupies himself with the Torah, the Shechinah is said to rest upon him' (iii. 3, 7).

The remarks upon this profoundly interesting passage in J. Weiss's commentary are a curious illustration of the inability of the German Protestant theologian to avoid pitfalls in dealing with the Rabbinic religion. Weiss holds, rightly enough, that the verse could not have been spoken by Jesus. It is based upon the faith of the Christian community in Christ's invisible presence through the prayers of those who believe in him. It is probably not merely a parallel to, but a Christian version of, the Jewish saying already quoted. Then Weiss must needs go on to show how much nobler and better and greater it is than the Jewish original. For instead of 'the abstract Law' you have a 'living personality'; instead of casuistic legal discussions you have the cultivation of pious memory and reverent obedience; instead of the 'incomprehensible phantasm of the "Glory" which is separated off from God and hovers as a sort of spirit over men,' you have the 'concrete' conception of the presence of the 'heavenly Lord himself with his spirit and his gifts.' How much more personal, intimate, and joyous the new religion is than the old! But must we always glorify our own possessions by running down our neighbours'? Moreover, a mere tiro in Rabbinics knows that the 'Law' in this passage is by no means limited to 'casuistic legal discussions'; there might be nothing casuistic or even legal about it!

A conversation about holiness, nay, even a joint prayer, would constitute in Rabbinic terminology 'words of Torah.' But suppose the discussion *were* about a legal matter, must it necessarily be 'casuistic'? And why is not the spiritual presence of God as pure and noble a thing as the spiritual presence of Christ? For the 'Shechinah' does not mean what J. Weiss says it means; it means just simply the mystic, yet real, presence of God. Might one not argue that the belief in this presence is just as joyous, as intimate, as 'personal,' as the belief in the presence of a strange being who to the writer of our passage was not God although divine? To many persons the conception of the presence of God seems even the grander, purer, and nobler idea. The joyousness, the 'Innigkeit' of the Rabbinic religion cannot be known to an outsider who only conceives of it as a dark foil and lurid contrast to his own creed. But so too the joyousness and 'Innigkeit' of Christianity cannot be more than dimly imagined by the Jewish outsider. Why may we not be satisfied with our own joyousness, our own 'Innigkeit,' without seeking to cheapen and disparage the joyousness and 'Innigkeit' of our neighbour?

21–35. The Duty of Forgiveness and the Parable of the Ungrateful Servant

(Matthew only; but *cp.* Luke xvii. 4)

21 Then came Peter to him, and said, 'Lord, how often shall my
brother sin against me, and I forgive him? till seven times?'
22 Jesus said unto him, 'I say not unto thee, Until seven times: but,
Until seventy times seven.

23 'Therefore the kingdom of heaven is likened unto a king, who
24 desired to settle accounts with his servants. And when he began
the settlement, one was brought to him, who owed him ten thou-
25 sand talents. And as he was unable to pay, the lord commanded
him to be sold, and his wife, and children, and all that he had, so
26 that payment should be made. Then the servant fell down, and
did him reverence, saying, Have patience with me, and I will pay
27 thee all. Then the lord of that servant was moved with com-
28 passion, and he loosed him, and forgave him the debt. But the
same servant, when he went out, found one of his fellow-servants,
who owed him an hundred shillings, and he seized him, and took
29 him by the throat, saying, Pay me what thou owest. And his
fellow-servant fell down, and besought him, saying, Have patience
30 with me, and I will pay thee. Yet he would not: but he went
31 away and cast him into prison, till he should pay the debt. So
when his fellow-servants saw what was happening, they were very
grieved, and they came and related unto their lord all that had
32 happened. Then his lord called him unto him and said to him,
O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou
33 besoughtest me: shouldest not thou also have had pity on thy
34 fellow-servant, even as I had pity on thee? And his lord in his
wrath delivered him up to the torturers, till he should pay all
35 that was due unto him. So also will my heavenly Father do unto
you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother.'

21, 22. It is disputed by the authorities whether the original form of Jesus's saying is better preserved by Matthew or by Luke (xvii. 4).

According to the Rabbinic teaching, one was bound to forgive one's 'brother' three times. *Cp.* Yoma 86, *b*. See also Additional Note 8.

22. 'Seventy times seven' is the probable translation of the Greek, which, however, is itself incorrect. Jesus means that there should be no limit to human, any more than there is to divine forgiveness. There may be a conscious reference to, and contrast with, Gen. iv. 24. 'A definite allusion to the Genesis story is highly probable. Jesus pointedly sets against the natural man's craving for seventy sevenfold revenge, the spiritual man's ambition to exercise the privilege of seventy sevenfold forgiveness' (Moulton). It is disputed whether 'brother' has the same meaning here as in 15. If Jesus is the author of the saying, it is possible that 'brother' is generally equivalent to neighbour. Jesus was not definitely thinking of his own disciples only; he was laying down a general rule. On the other hand, it would not be fair to press the inclusiveness of the word 'brother.' It does *not* mean—though the motive for giving it as wide an implication as possible is very obvious!—'your brother, whether a Christian or no.' Jesus was not thinking of these subtleties. He just means your neighbour. He did not consciously mean to imply: 'The unrepentant Jew as well as the believing Christian.' Matthew omits what Luke retains, namely, the repentance of the neighbour which is, Loisy holds, nevertheless, a condition of pardon. 'La rancune à l'égard du prochain n'est jamais permise, mais l'oubli des injures personnelles et les rapports fraternels ne sont pas possibles tant que le prochain garde une attitude malveillante' (*E. S.* II. p. 94).

25. *καὶ ἀποδοθῆναι*: *i.e.* with the money that the man and his family brought in, the king was to be paid.

34. The 'torturers.' Torture was introduced by Herod into Judæa. In Rabbinic law it is forbidden. Thus the story would not be possible under the merciful rulings of the Jewish law, but that law was doubtless not always enforced.

35. *Cp.* Mark xi. 26. The king is dropped after the first verse of the parable, and we seem then to have only to do with a wealthy master or merchant and his slave. We may, however, suppose that the ungrateful servant is the chief prefect or viceroy of the king. He has farmed the taxes of the whole kingdom, and owes the king the huge sum of 10,000 talents (=£2,062,500). The viceroy tries to get in the moneys due to him from the under-prefects or satraps. Torture was commonly applied in the east when governors of provinces failed to hand in the taxes and tribute to the treasury, or were detected in cheating.

The parable is one of the simplest, though not the deepest, in the Gospel. There is no reason why it should not be authentic.

The moral is clear, and wholly in accordance with Rabbinic teaching. The king is God who has to forgive man far more than man has to forgive his neighbour. But unless man forgives his neighbour, God will not forgive him. *Cp.* Sirach xxviii. 1–7; Matt. vi. 14, 15.

The opening words, 'Therefore the Kingdom of Heaven is likened unto,' would mean that in the Kingdom such a forgiving disposition is expected of all its members. The aorist *ὡμοιώθη* is said by some to indicate that the Kingdom is thought of as already begun. 'Der Aorist deutet auf das bereits zur Realität Gewordene hin' (Holtzmann). How far such an intention existed in the Aramaic original is very doubtful. *Cp.* Mr Allen's note on xi. 16, xiii. 24.

CHAPTER XIX

1–12. Divorce and Adultery

(*Cp.* Mark x. 1–12)

1 And it came to pass, that when Jesus had finished these
sayings, he departed from Galilee, and came into the district of
2 Judæa beyond the Jordan; and great crowds followed him; and
he healed them there.

3 And some Pharisees came unto him, to test him, saying
unto him, 'Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife for every
4 cause?' And he answered and said unto them, 'Have ye not
read, that the Creator made them from the beginning male and
5 female, and said, For this reason shall a man leave father and
mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one
6 flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What
then God hath joined together, let not man separate.'

7 They said unto him, 'Why then did Moses command to give
8 a bill of divorce, and to send her away?' He said unto them,
'Because of the hardness of your hearts Moses permitted you to
9 divorce your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. And
I say unto you, whoever divorceth his wife, except for unchastity,
and marrieth another, committeth adultery.'

10 His disciples said unto him, 'If such is the position of a man
11 to his wife, it is not desirable to marry.' But he said unto them,
'All men cannot receive this saying, but only they to whom it
12 is given. For there are eunuchs, who were born so from their
mother's womb: and there are eunuchs, who were made eunuchs
by men: and there are eunuchs, who have made themselves
eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. He that is
able to receive it, let him receive it.'

Mark's order is still followed, as it has been since xiv. Chapter xviii. had ended the section which began with xiii. Now begins the penultimate section reaching to xxv. inclusive.

2. He teaches the multitude in Mark; he heals them in Matthew.

3. The form of the discussion here has already been spoken about in the notes on Mark x. Jesus gives his own view at once, and it is the Pharisees who raise the difficulty about the Mosaic law. Mr Allen takes the line that Jesus prohibited divorce altogether. He supposes that 'for every cause' and 'except for unchastity' are insertions by the editor of Matthew into the narrative. 'The motive of these insertions can only be conjectured. But in view of other features of the Gospel it is probable that the editor was a Jewish Christian who has here judaised, or rather rabbinised, Christ's sayings. Just as he has so arranged v. 16–20 as to represent Christ's attitude to the Law to be that of the Rabbinical Jews, who regarded every letter of the Law as permanently valid, so here he has so shaped Christ's teaching about divorce as to make it consonant with the permanent validity of the Pentateuchal Law and harmonious with the stricter school of Jewish theologians. It is probably to the same strain in the editor's character, the same Jewish Christian jealousy for the honour of the Law and for the privileges of the Jewish people, that the prominence given to Peter (xvi. 19) and the preservation of such sayings as x. 5, 6, 23 is due. And to the same source may probably be attributed the judaising of Christ's language, in such expressions as "the Kingdom of the heavens," "the Father who is in the heavens."'

5. 'The idea seems to be that God created a single pair, who were therefore destined for one another. It was also written that a man should forsake his parents and cleave to his wife, and that he and his wife should be one flesh. In other words, married couples were in respect of unity, as the first pair created by God, destined for one another. Divorce therefore should be out of the question' (Allen).

8. Matthew adds, 'from the beginning it was not so.' The higher law, now resumed at the advent of the Kingdom, was for a time modified owing to the hardness of the Israelite heart. Of course, the implication which Jesus finds in the words of Genesis is not really to be found there.

Merx is interesting, if not convincing, on this section about divorce. His conclusions are vitiated by his theory that Matthew is earlier than Mark.

In 4 he reads with the S.S.: 'have ye not read that he who made the male made also the female?' This he thinks means that the woman is as much a creature of God as the man; the two sexes are equal and coordinate. Woman is not the dependent of man. Just because of this equality (so the S.S. in 5, 'because of this') does man become one flesh with his wife. This conception of marriage as the union of two persons with equal rights ('zweie gleichberechtigte Personen') was wholly new, for in Jewish law the woman was subordinate. Hence the unity effected by marriage is insoluble by man. Man and woman were once for all united together by God at the creation. Merx thinks that there is also a further implication in Jesus's words. Not only can no third party (*e.g.* a court) dissolve that which has become a perfect unity by divine decree, but because the two parties are equal and coordinate, one of them cannot of his own will dissolve the unity. Then Merx adds: 'This is valid for the ideal marriage, as the sentences of the Sermon on the Mount are valid for the ideal society. Society which is still under the dominion of sin needs the safety-valve of divorce to obviate greater evils. Churches which forbid it confuse the actual condition of the world with the ideal condition of the kingdom of God, with which such Churches falsely identify themselves' (*Das Evangelium Matthäus*, p. 272). Thus no divorce is an ideal to which at present we cannot conform. Jesus in fact announces a doctrine, to which we cannot as yet adhere. The conclusion seems somewhat lame.

The specific addition of Matthew in verse 3, *κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν*, 'for every cause,' is, of course, warmly defended by Merx as original. The Jews could not have asked any other question. They could not have asked is divorce allowable, for the Law says it is. The only question in dispute was whether it was allowable (as Hillel taught) 'for every cause'—if a man saw a woman he liked better, or if a woman spoiled a man's soup. Or was it only allowable (as Shammai taught) for some shameful cause, *i.e.* for some disgraceful action upon the part of the woman. The Pharisees ask Jesus which side he takes in the controversy. He, as is his wont, does not reply directly to the question asked, but lifts the whole subject on to a higher plane. Merx adds: 'Mark has omitted the principal element in the question of the Pharisees, the *κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν*, *i.e.* for every cause; whereby the narrative is placed very accurately in its historical setting. This omission makes the question no longer Jewish but universal:—namely, as to the permissibility of divorce. This is a palpable remodelling of the original form into a purely ecclesiastical discussion. Mark writes in circumstances in which the Jewish question discussed in the Jewish schools had lost its interest. He is later than

Matthew' (*Das Evangelium Matthäus*, p. 274). Merx urges that the further argument is much more logical in Matthew. The Pharisees, amazed by the boldness of Jesus's reply, say, (according to the slightly different version of the S.S.), 'How can you say that divorce is wrong seeing that we have an order from Moses that if a man wishes to divorce his wife he shall give her a bill of divorce?' Then Jesus replies that a concession was made by Moses—not willed by God—on account of the hardness of their hearts. D. H. Müller (*Die Bergpredigt im Lichte der Strophentheorie*, p. 19) takes the same line as Merx, and apparently without any knowledge of what Merx has written. The question can, he thinks, have only been put to Jesus in the form in which we find it in Matt. xix. For the current question in dispute was whether divorce must be limited to those cases where a man has found in his wife עֶרְוַת דָּבָר (R.V. 'some unseemly thing'), or whether it might be extended wherever the woman no longer 'found favour in the eyes' of her lord. But there was a further dispute as to the exact meaning of עֶרְוַת דָּבָר, words which are by no means easy to understand. It might mean a physical blemish; *cp.* the use of the same words in Deut. xxiii. 15 (E.V. 14) where R.V. renders 'no unclean thing.' Jesus cut the knot by proclaiming the indissolubility of marriage upon the basis of Gen. ii. 24. He might have quoted Malachi ii. 16, 'For I, the Lord, hate divorce.' Müller also, like Merx, calls attention to the obviously intended correction of the Pharisees' ἐνετείλατο by Jesus's ἐπέτρεψεν. Moses 'allowed' divorce; he did not 'command' it. Thus the new teaching of Jesus does not annul the Law; it fulfils it. *Cp.* Luke xvi. 17, 18.

9. The private addition to the disciples in Mark is here part of the general statement to the Pharisees. Matthew's addition, 'except for unchastity,' has already been discussed in the notes on Mark. It may be that, as Loisy thinks, both the addition ('for every cause') to the question in verse 3 and the extra qualification here are both later insertions. See also chapter v. verse 32. The S.S. reads 'except for adultery.'

10–12. A further conversation between the disciples and Jesus is here added. It is original to Matthew.

10. The disciples make the exceedingly naïve and candid remark that if the relation of a man to his wife is to be such that he can never, at his own pleasure, get rid of her, it were best not to marry at all. *αἰτία.* The word apparently refers back to the same word in 3. The exact meaning seems to be: If this is the

ground (of divorce) between man and woman, *i.e.* if he may never divorce her unless she has been unchaste, then it is better not to marry. W. takes the word *αἰτία* to mean 'relation,' 'Verhältniss,' but it is doubtful if it can mean that.

11. The reply of Jesus is highly remarkable, and, as W. says, in bad accord with the true purpose of the whole section, the object of which is to sanctify marriage, not to discredit it. He accepts the remark of the disciples, but gives it a new meaning. It *is* better not to marry at all, but not for the sordid reason of convenience given by the disciples. The 'word' which not all can comprehend is that contained in the interjection of the disciples: *i.e.* *οὐ συμφέρει γαμῆσαι*, 'it is best not to marry,' 'it is not expedient to marry.' Another reading omits the *τοῦτον*. 'The word' may then refer not to the statement of the disciples, but to what Jesus is about to say. (So J. Weiss.)

Only those to whom God grants the necessary insight can receive or comprehend the true meaning of the saying. Let those who have this insight, receive it.

12. The true meaning is now given in strange and startling language. For the sake of the Highest, for the sake of the Kingdom of Heaven, in order to labour for it exclusively, without any obstacle or tie, there are those who have voluntarily refrained from marriage. It is not necessarily meant that those who did or do this physically deprived themselves of their manhood. But the language is very strange, and has actually led to gravest evil. We must remember that Jesus himself was unmarried, and this very fact led to the terrible deduction that celibacy and virginity are higher than marriage and wedded life. Here is one of the few points in which Jesus seems distinctly anti-Jewish.

The passage 10–12 has doubtless its quasi-justification. The celibacy of the Roman Catholic priest has its noble and its useful side. And if Jesus believed that the ordinary life of man was soon to come to a sudden and dramatic close, if the regular propagation of mankind was soon to cease, and the flow of generations to end, it was perhaps tolerably justifiable to say that, in the short interval left, the best thing was to prepare for it and not to think of ordinary earthly ties, duties and pleasures, which were all soon to pass away.

It is quite a different thing if the passage is read without this background and expectation. Then it implies that for all time the highest thing is celibacy. To such a doctrine Judaism is most intensely opposed. The passage also implies the doctrine of a sort of double morality, one for the ordinary man, another for him who would be perfect. (For those 'in the world' and for the 'religious' as Roman Catholics would say.) In spite of the noble lives to which this double morality has led, Judaism is, I think, indubitably right in repudiating it. Judaism has consistently deprecated and depreciated celibacy; it has required its saints to show their sanctity *in* the world and amid the ties and obligations of family life. Asceticism has its justifications, but, on the whole, when its practice involves a separation from the world and from the ordinary ties of man, it is rather an evil than a good. At certain epochs in the world's history the celibate ascetic may have been necessary and desirable, but husband and wife surely constitute a more permanent and nobler excellence.

Is the saying authentic? J. Weiss points out that unless Jesus was referring to himself (that for the sake of the Kingdom he had deliberately renounced the joys of married life), it must be later than he. Mr Allen argues that if 11 is authentic, it suits better with the teaching of Mark about divorce than with that of Matthew, and is an argument for the authenticity of Mark's version. 'For the saying of the disciples, that if Christ's exposition of the question of divorce were to hold good, marriage would be a burden better left alone, seems to arise naturally enough from the strict teaching that divorce is not permissible, whilst it is very unexpected in the mouths of Christ's disciples as a protest against the doctrine that divorce should be limited to cases of adultery.' Loisy is rather undecided as to the authenticity. On the one hand he says that, in spite of the setting, which by referring back to the insertion in 3 is secondary, both form and matter of the adages wear a most authentic character. On the other hand he points out that Paul knew no order of Jesus about virginity, and that therefore these sayings *may* be a product of Christian tradition. Nevertheless Paul may not have known them, or he may not have regarded them as a *precept*, as in truth they cannot rightly be regarded (*E. S.* II. pp. 202, 203). A fine and temperate exposition and defence of Roman Catholic teaching upon marriage and virginity may be read in Baron v. Hügel's great book, *The Mystic Element in Religion*, II. pp. 126-129.

13-15. JESUS AND THE CHILDREN

(*Cp.* Mark x. 13-16; Luke xviii. 15-17)

13 Then were there brought unto him little children, that he should put his hands on them, and pray: and the disciples
14 rebuked them. But Jesus said, 'Permit the little children, and

forbid them not, to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of
15 heaven.' And he laid his hands on them, and departed thence.

The more active human touches are lost in Matthew's version. Jesus is not allowed to be 'displeased' with the disciples; he may not take the children in his arms. Mark x. 15 is wanting here. Matthew has already used it in xviii. 3. Matthew adds, 'he laid his hands on them'; the outward accompaniment of blessing. Mark's words, 'they brought young children to him for him to *touch* them,' mean the same thing.

16–30. THE DANGER OF WEALTH

(*Cp.* Mark x. 17–31; Luke xviii. 18–30, xxii. 28–30)

16 And, behold, one came up to him and said, 'Master, what good
17 shall I do, that I may obtain eternal life?' And he said unto
him, 'Why askest thou me about the good? One is the good:
but if thou desirest to enter into Life, keep the commandments.'
18 He said unto him, 'Which?' Jesus said, 'Thou shalt do no
murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal,
19 Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy
20 mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' The
young man said unto him, 'All these things have I observed:
21 what lack I yet?' Jesus said unto him, 'If thou wilt be perfect,
go, sell thy goods, and give them to the poor, and thou shalt
22 obtain treasure in heaven: and come, follow me.' But when the
young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he
had great possessions.

23 Then said Jesus unto his disciples, 'Verily I say unto you,
A rich man shall with difficulty enter the kingdom of heaven.
24 And again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through
the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom
25 of God.' But when the disciples heard that, they were greatly
26 appalled, saying, 'Who then can be saved?' But Jesus looked
at them, and said, 'With men this is impossible; but with God all
things are possible.'

27 Then answered Peter and said unto him, 'Lo, *we* have aban-
28 doned all, and followed thee; what then will be ours?' And
Jesus said unto them, 'Verily I say unto you, At the New Birth,

when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye
who have followed me shall also sit yourselves upon twelve
29 thrones, ruling the twelve tribes of Israel. And every one that
hath abandoned house, or brothers, or sisters, or father, or mother,
or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and
30 shall inherit everlasting life. But many that are now first shall
be last; and the last first.'

17. It is intensely important and interesting to note the changes which Matthew has made to avoid the declaration of Jesus in Mark that only God is good, and that he, Jesus, is not to be so called.

In Mark we have, '*Good* master, what shall I do?' &c.

In Matthew it is, 'Master, what *good* shall I do?'

In Mark Jesus says: 'Why callest thou *me good*? No one is good except God alone.'

In Matthew Jesus says: 'Why askest thou me *about the good*? *One is the good*.'

Matthew rather awkwardly keeps εἷς ὁ ἀγαθός, which is based on Mark's οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ Θεός, although the words have really no meaning without the repudiation of 'goodness' as applied to Jesus. Merx tries to show that Matthew originally read as Mark reads. The text has been altered for dogmatic reasons.

18. Matthew makes the man ask which commandments he should keep in order to attain the result which he desires. In the reply of Jesus, 'Thou shalt not defraud' is omitted, and instead of the Tenth Commandment the famous 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' (Lev. xix. 18) is inserted. *Cp.* xxii. 39. Merx points out that S.S. omits: 'Thou shalt not steal.' This, he says, is 'höchst auffallend,' for in the Sermon on the Mount the Seventh Commandment is also omitted.

20. Matthew specially dubs the questioner a young man, and hence he is compelled to omit 'from my youth up.' But S.S. has 'from my youth up' and Merx ardently defends it. He has to translate, 'from my boyhood,' and thus makes a distinction between νεανίσκος ('a young man') and νεότης ('boyhood'). Is this feasible? He then points out that τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ; ('what lack I yet?') is wanting in the S.S., and on this omission and its correctness he has the following most interesting remarks: 'Origen observes that Mark and Luke do not include the words "Love thy neighbour as thyself," and that in the reasoning of Matthew there is something inconclusive, if he "who has kept the whole law" is nevertheless not perfect. Origen asks whether this difficulty

cannot be to some extent resolved by supposing the words "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" to be not authentic, but the addition of someone, who did not understand the exact sense of the narrative. The phrase "One thing thou lackest" in Mark x. 21, Luke xviii. 22 is in favour of this supposition, for if the man had also fulfilled the duty of love, he in truth lacked nothing.

'But what,' says Merx, 'if with the S.S. we omit "What lack I yet?" In that case the flow of the thought is perfectly smooth. "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments; nothing extraordinary is needed beyond that." Then the reply: "that have I done from my boyhood up." Then the climax: "if thou wilt be perfect, give up thy worldly goods, so thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and follow me." Entrance into the heavenly life and perfection are opposed to each other, the imperfect are not lost, but only the renunciation of all one's possessions for the sake of the poor is the complete fulfilling of the law of love of one's neighbour. By the insertion of "What lack I yet (in order to attain the heavenly life)?" the climax is interrupted, and the deepening of the law of love of one's neighbour is lost' (*Das Evangelium Matthäus*, p. 285).

Loisy regards the words as quite genuine to Matthew. They are Matthew's variant for Mark's 'One thing thou lackest.' They are intended to express a certain air of self-satisfaction in the man, which Mark did not ascribe to him.

21. Matthew omits, as usual, the human touches about Jesus. He does not 'look at' or 'feel love for' the man.

'If thou wilt be perfect' is peculiar to Matthew. As Holtzmann says, Matthew clearly distinguishes between a morality which is realized in keeping the commandments and is adequate for salvation, and a higher 'perfection' which is conditional on absolute self-devotion, abnegation, and poverty. Later writers elaborated this theory. It is the Church compromise between the capacities of the ordinary man, the needs of society, the propagation of the race, on the one hand, and the unrestricted ascetic rigorism of some of the Master's utterances, upon the other. It is the theory of a double morality, and of the higher perfection of an ascetic life of poverty and celibacy. (*Cp.* Pfleiderer, Vol. I. p. 587.) As J. Weiss says, Matthew by this distinction between adequate goodness and 'counsels of perfection' introduced a fateful ('verhängnisvolles') principle into Christian ethics. Loisy thinks this interpretation goes too far. Matthew is merely contrasting Christian perfection with the insufficiency of 'legal works.' But the fundamental meaning is no more and no less than what is found in Mark. 'What is wanting' refers to the attainment of eternal life, and Jesus does mean to imply that he who is intensely keen on the Kingdom, and wants to be sure of a place in it, must quit all and follow the Master. The counsel which Jesus gives is not a 'programme facultatif et de surérogation.' 'A l'heure où Jésus parle, quiconque veut sincèrement le règne de Dieu doit tout quitter pour suivre celui qui l'amène sur la terre.' 'Il faut dire seulement que le développement de l'antithèse entre la justice de la Loi et la justice évangélique, surajouté à l'anecdote primitive, est conduit avec une certaine gaucherie' (*E. S.* II. pp. 213, 214). For an example of the way in which thoughts may be read into the words of Matthew I may cite Mr Allen: 'What could be said to a man of this sort, one who conceived of eternal life as something to be acquired by merit, as a day labourer earns a wage; one who regarded "goodness" as a definite and ascertainable quantity which could be worked off; one who so misunderstood the Commandments, and so deceived himself as to suppose that he had kept them; one who could ask the question, "What do I yet lack?" "If thou wilt be perfect," says the Lord. The words are, of course, a descent to the level of the questioner. He thought of perfection as attainable by works, and the Lord took him at his own estimation, and proposed to him a task which would not lead him to perfection, but which would do one of two things. If he obeyed, he might learn in the service of Christ something of the spirit of the Gospel, which sets before men the ideal of the divine perfection, v. 48, and which never can conceive of perfection as a goal reached; *cp.* Luke xvii. 10. If he found the task too hard for him, he would have learned to be less confident of his own capacity to do the one thing needful for inheritance of eternal life.' But surely the words of Jesus are 'of course' not meant to be 'a descent to the level of the questioner.' They are meant quite simply and seriously. There is no question here of works *versus* faith, or grace *versus* merit, or goodness as quantity *versus* an unattainable ideal of the divine perfection. All this is read into the text and is not in it. To point out how works are yet compatible with spirit, or how there can be Pharisaic and legal saints just as well as there can be Pauline and Gospel saints is beyond the limits of a note. But it would be a good thing if Pauline Christians could be made to see Rabbinic holiness from the inside, alive and at work, and if Jewish legalists could be brought into close contact with Pauline holiness in a similarly experimental way.

And does not Mr Allen himself in another place and mood speak of those 'who spend their lives *in endeavours to fulfil the requirements of the Law*, and to obtain the "righteousness" which God demands'? And does he not say of them that 'such whole-hearted search will not fail'? That is a very fair definition of the true Pharisee or disciple of the Rabbis, and of them it may be truly said: 'such whole-hearted search will not fail.'

23–25. Matthew omits any general assertion that it is hard for anybody to enter the Kingdom. He speaks only of the rich. But the amazement of the disciples, and their question, 'Who then can be saved?' seem now unmotived.

27. Peter expresses his meaning rather more definitely in Matthew than in Mark. He says: 'What will be *our* fate?' Surely, he would imply, *we*, at any rate, shall win eternal life.

28. This verse is not in Mark. It is paralleled in Luke xxii. 28–30. The twelve apostles are here given a special place and prerogative. παλιγγενεσία is a word only found here and in one other passage (Titus iii. 5) in the New Testament. It is used by Josephus for the new birth of the Jewish nation after the return from Babylonian exile, and by Philo of the new birth of the earth after the flood and after its destruction by fire. The new birth here denotes the world or Israel at the time of the second advent—at the Parousia. The Son of man is Jesus, who sits upon his Messianic throne. Around him sit the twelve apostles as princes, judging, or, as W. says, *ruling*, the tribes of Israel. Does this verse, or do the ideas expressed in it, go back to Jesus? Pfleiderer thinks they do. The 'Kingdom,' as Jesus taught, has to be realized on earth, just like the Messianic Kingdom of the Jews (Vol. I. p. 620). So too, emphatically, Loisy. 'The promise, and the special form in which it is couched in Matthew and Luke, go back unquestionably to the primitive tradition, which knew of no recompense for renouncement in this world except such recompense as would be given in the Kingdom' (*E. S.* II. p. 222). J. Weiss, on the contrary, thinks the verse and its ideas probably do *not* go back to Jesus, partly because the conception of the future Kingdom is so naïvely particularist (there is no thought of a rejection of the Jews or an inclusion of the heathen: contrast viii. 11), and partly because Jesus was rather inclined to damp than to encourage the ambitious hopes and wishes of his disciples. *Cp.* xviii. 1, xx. 20. Völter thinks that the verse in Matthew is based upon Luke xxii. 28–30 and represents its latest form. The 'Son of man' in its later sense as equivalent to Jesus in his capacity of apocalyptic judge and king has been added by Matthew (*Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu*, p. 16). We may assume that verse 28, corresponding as, to some extent, it does with Luke xxii. 28–30, is based upon Q. It has been observed in the notes on Mark (p. 254) that B. Weiss argues that verse 29 is also

taken ultimately from the same source. Note the correspondence of *πολλαπλασίονα* in 29 and in Luke xviii. 30 as against Mark's *ἑκατονταπλασίονα.* It is also to be observed that Mark's long enumeration, which wears a late and secondary character, of the details of the reward in this life are omitted by both Matthew and Luke. *Quellen*, A, pp. 123, 124.

The story of the young man with great possessions will always move and touch him who reads or hears it. It is one more illustration of the superb dramatic power of the Gospels. Whatever criticism we may make upon 'the one thing wanting,' we cannot hesitate to affirm that it puts forward one interpretation of life with incomparable power, simplicity, and art.

CHAPTER XX

1-16. THE PARABLE OF THE LABOURERS IN THE VINEYARD
(Matthew only)

1 'For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a householder, who
went out early in the morning to hire labourers for his vineyard.
2 And when he had agreed with the labourers for a shilling a day,
3 he sent them into his vineyard. And he went out about the third
4 hour, and saw others standing idle in the marketplace, and he said
unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard, and whatever is right
5 I will give you. So they went. Again he went out about the
6 sixth and ninth hour, and did the same as before. And about
the eleventh hour he went out, and found others standing about,
7 and said unto them, Why stand ye here all the day idle? They
said unto him, Because no man has hired us. He said unto them,
Go ye also into the vineyard; and whatsoever is right, that shall
8 ye receive. But when the evening had come, the lord of the
vineyard said unto his steward, Call the labourers, and pay them
9 their hire, beginning from the last unto the first. And when
they came that were hired about the eleventh hour, they received
10 every man a shilling. But when the first came, they supposed
that they would receive more; yet they likewise received every
11 man a shilling. So when they received it, they murmured against
12 the master of the house, saying, These last have worked but one
hour, and thou hast made them equal unto us, who have borne
13 the burden and heat of the day. But he answered one of them,
and said, Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst not thou agree with
14 me for a shilling? Take what is thine, and go thy way: I like

15 to give unto this last, even as unto thee. Have I not the right to
do what I like with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am
16 good? So the last shall be first, and the first last.'

This parable, one of the greatest and most glorious of all, occurs only in Matthew. It would seem that it was not originally intended to illustrate the proverb about the first being last and the last first. That proverb, as used in Mark x. 31 and Matt. xix. 30, meant that many of those who were then first (in wealth and position) should in the new era be last: *i.e.* excluded from the Messianic glory or the 'future life' altogether. Those who had renounced all, and were now 'last,' will then be first. Or, again, it meant that many who thought themselves most virtuous and most worthy of the Kingdom should see the repentant tax-collectors and sinners enter in before them.

But the parable was originally intended to teach something quite different. It was intended to teach that the 'eternal life' is the result of grace rather than of work; or, at any rate, that the laws which govern admission to it are quite different from those which govern business transactions upon earth. A little in the eyes of God may be equivalent to a great deal in the eyes of man; from unequal opportunities God will not demand equal results, but to unequal results God may give equal 'rewards.' Even if, at the last hour, a man chooses the better part, and does his best, his reward after death may be the same as that given to another who had laboured for goodness much longer. God gives of His own, and He gives His grace in full measure. He does not bargain and chaffer. It is not implied that there are no grades in the eternal life, but only that God, in His grace, will grant this one great, priceless, and always undeserved boon to a number of persons who, looked at from human, business lines, on rigid tit-for-tat principles, should be rewarded most unequally. Tit for tat may do for earth; it is not good enough for heaven. Though there may be grades in eternal life, the mere possession of it puts all who possess it on an equality of 'reward' and an equality of grace and demerit. Though the unbeliever and bad man may not gain it, it is only by God's grace that the good man gets it. It narrows the parable too much to say with B. Weiss (*Das Matthäus-Evangelium*) that its purpose is only to show that in the Kingdom all are on an equal footing, for all receive the same reward. Nor is it just to say that the parable is directed against 'jüdische Ansprüche' (Holtzmann). It is quite general and broadly human.

It is not implied that the actual sinner obtains the Kingdom, or that there are *no* 'tests' in order to be admitted to it. M. Loisy says, rightly enough, 'one must have merited it in some sort, but the divine goodness supplies what is wanting to the "merit" of many.' Eternal life is not a reward 'proportioned to the time a man has passed in the practice of religious rites or to the quantity of works of piety he has performed.' 'God gives as a grace to repentant sinners what He gives to the just as a remuneration.' It is not meant that 'absolute equality is the law of the Kingdom, for other discourses show that there is a relation between sacrifice and recompense, and that there is a distinction of places in the eternal city' (*E. S.* II. p. 228).

The parable, in fact, supplies a close parallel to the frequent Talmudic phrase (used most aptly at the end of the amazing story in Abodah Zarah 17 *a*, Wuensche, *Der babylonische Talmud*, II. 3, p. 334), 'Some enter the Kingdom in an hour, while others hardly reach it after a lifetime.'

In this general sense the parable may well go back to Jesus and be perfectly authentic. To Matthew it may, however, have implied that those who joined Jesus and his community early, and those who joined it late, may expect the same reward. At the Parousia all believers will be treated alike. This point is strongly brought out by W. To Matthew the vineyard (which goes back ultimately to Isaiah v.) is the Christian community. The workmen, whether they began to work in it early or late, are all Christians, and will all enter into the perfected Kingdom. Similarly Mr Allen. 'The parable, as originally spoken, can hardly have had any other object than that of warning Christ's first disciples, that others who should become His disciples at a later date would also be partakers of privileges equal to theirs who had first joined Him.' But the question is whether 'as originally spoken' is accurate. Only if it be not accurate is the parable likely to be authentic.

2. Some commentators lay stress upon the first set of labourers working for a fixed hire, upon an agreement. But this does not seem an incident to be pressed. It only gives a point, and supplies an occasion, for the *dénouement* and the moral.

3. The labourers are not blamed for being idle. Nor are differences intended between those in 3, 5, or 6. All are alike. The 'third hour,' that is, about 9 A.M.

9. Only the last and the first are mentioned, on account of the proverb; but the end of 8 implies that all the labourers received the same sum.

13. As the first labourers got the amount for which they had agreed to work, they had nothing to complain of. We are not, I imagine, to translate the argument into the moral. It is not

intended to imply that the eternal life will be for any the mere reward of a pact, a retribution for service agreed upon and rendered. Only this is meant: that just as the first labourers had no reason to complain, for they got their due, so have none reason to complain if the same life eternal is given alike to those who 'deserve' it more and to those who 'deserve' it less. From one point of view none deserve it; from another, if those who most deserve it obtain it, how can they complain if, by God's goodness, those also obtain it who deserve it less? Perhaps, too, it may even be hinted that in the perfected Kingdom, if grades there be, none have a right to claim special place on the ground of special service. The services which precede (but are not the purchase-money of) eternal life are not considered to possess so many varying degrees of worth. The services are on an equality. God treats them in His goodness alike, for it is only through God's goodness (which all men need) that eternal life can be attained.

Is the teaching of this parable a contrast to the teaching of the Rabbis? It is usually said to be so in the highest degree; for the Rabbinic teaching is said to ask men to be good for the sake of reward, and to declare that the entire action of God is governed, both here and hereafter, by the strictest application of measure for measure and tit for tat. Such criticism is grossly exaggerated. But it cannot be denied that both in the Old Testament and in the Rabbinical literature the principle of measured retribution and reward is very prominent. That the Rabbis had a peculiar 'lust for reward' is false. They were no more and no less anxious for the joys of the Hereafter than their Christian contemporaries. But the doctrine of the parable does supply a corrective to a frequent element of their teaching. It emphasizes that, in addition to the principle of retribution (which Jesus by no means denies), there is also the principle of grace. It teaches the doctrine of *In Memoriam*, that

> merit lives from man to man,
> And not from man, O Lord, to Thee.

It is reasonable enough that Jülicher and others should laugh at the Rabbinic parallel to this parable which is quoted by Wuensche; for that parallel has precisely the opposite moral. It says that God can justly reward two hours' work as he rewards ten, because one man in two hours may do (*i.e.* deserves) as much as another in ten. The parable in Matthew says the reverse. The workmen have not done the same: there *is* inequality of service; and yet the reward is the same. That is the higher justice of grace and love upon which God acts.

But there are not wanting even in the Rabbinic literature examples of this view. See Additional Note 47. Nevertheless the worth of the parable for us, and its originality, are not impaired by these parallels. Moreover, most Jews know intimately no sacred literature beyond the Old Testament. The loss of such a grand parable is grave.

16. It is probable that the adage is superadded and does not belong to the original parable. It can only be kept by giving it a strained sense. Those who are admitted after one 'hour' seem more favoured than those who are admitted after many 'hours.' But this is surely very awkward. Matthew, however, looks at the parable in a different way. He interprets it either, as W. thinks (see above), in which case he would mean by the verse that the last comers may have even a higher place in the Kingdom than the earliest disciples, or he interprets it, as Loisy thinks, namely, of believers and unbelievers. In that case 'last' means, not 'last' *in* the Kingdom, but excluded from it altogether. And in that case too the words, found in some MSS., 'many are called, but few chosen' (xxii. 14), may have been added at the same time. The many who are called are the Jews as a nation, the few chosen are the Christian believers.

17–19. Third Prediction of Suffering and Death

(*Cp.* Mark x. 32–34; Luke xviii. 31–34)

17 And as Jesus was going up to Jerusalem, he took the Twelve
18 aside privately, and said unto them, 'Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man will be delivered up to the chief priests and the scribes, and they will condemn him to death.
19 And they will deliver him up to the heathen to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him: and on the third day he will rise.'

19. The crucifixion is added in Matthew to what had been said in Mark. The S.S. has here, as it has in Mark x. 33, 'to the people' (*i.e.* the Jewish people) in the singular, and not like the Greek, 'to the nations' (*i.e.* the heathen). This reading is one more of the tendencies by which the guilt is thrown upon the Jews, and the Romans are exonerated. *Cp.* xxvii. 27–30. Both Matthew and Luke have 'upon the third day' instead of Mark's 'after three days.'

20–28. THE SONS OF ZEBEDEE

(*Cp.* Mark x. 35–45; Luke xxii. 24–27)

20 Then came to him the mother of the sons of Zebedee with her
21 sons, doing him reverence, and petitioning him. And he said
unto her, 'What dost thou want?' She said unto him, 'Say that
these my two sons shall sit, the one on thy right hand, and the
22 other on the left, in thy kingdom.' But Jesus answered and
said, 'Ye know not what ye ask. Can ye drink of the cup that
23 I am about to drink of?' They said unto him, 'We can.' And
he said unto them, 'Ye shall drink indeed of my cup: but to sit
on my right hand and on my left, this is not mine to give, but it
shall be for them for whom it is prepared by my Father.'

24 And when the ten heard it, they were indignant against the
25 two brothers. But Jesus called them unto him, and said, 'Ye
know that they who rule over the nations lord it over them, and
26 their great ones play the tyrant over them. But it shall not
be so among you: but whoever wisheth to become great among
27 you, let him be your servant; and whoever would be first among
28 you, let him be your slave. Even as the Son of man came not
to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for
many.'

20. In Mark the two apostles themselves make the request; here their mother makes it instead; but Jesus's reply in 22 is addressed to them. 'Two eminent apostles are thus in part, at any rate, relieved of the charge of ambition.' Carpenter, *First Three Gospels*, p. 288.

21. 'In thy Kingdom' instead of Mark's, 'at thy glory.' The meaning is the same.

22. The second clause in Mark x. 38 about the 'baptism' is omitted by Matthew.

23. Note the addition, 'by my Father.' Jesus does not so speak of God in Mark. In Matthew he is already the *special* Son of God.

29–34. HEALING OF TWO BLIND MEN

(*Cp.* Mark x. 46–52; Luke xviii. 35–43)

29 And as they departed from Jericho, a great crowd followed
30 him. And, behold, two blind men sitting by the way side, when
they heard that Jesus was passing by, cried out, saying, 'Have
31 pity on us, son of David.' And the crowd rebuked them, that
they should hold their peace: but they cried the more loudly,
32 saying, 'Have pity on us, son of David.' And Jesus stood still,
and called them, and said, 'What do ye wish that I should do
33 unto you?' They said unto him, 'Lord, that our eyes may be
34 opened.' Then Jesus was moved with compassion, and touched
their eyes: and immediately they received their sight again, and
they followed him.

Matthew turns the one blind man (Bartimæus) of Mark x. 46 into two blind men, perhaps to compensate for the blind man mentioned in Mark viii. 22–26. It is at any rate curious that the wording in 34 (Jesus touches their eyes) recalls part of the procedure of Mark viii. 22–26. In the healing of Bartimæus Jesus does not touch him. *Cp.* also Matt. ix. 27–31.

CHAPTER XXI

1-11. THE ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM

(*Cp.* Mark xi. 1-11; Luke xix. 23-38)

1 And when they drew nigh unto Jerusalem, and had come to Bethphage, unto the mount of Olives, then Jesus sent forth two
2 disciples, saying unto them, 'Go into the village before you, and straightway ye will find an ass tied, and a colt with her: loose
3 them, and bring them unto me. And if any man say ought unto you, ye shall say, The Lord has need of them; and straightway he will send them.'

4 All this happened, that that might be fulfilled which was
5 spoken by the prophet, saying, 'Tell ye the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, gentle and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of a beast of burden.'

6 And the disciples went, and did as Jesus had commanded them.
7 And they brought the ass and the colt, and put garments upon
8 them, and he sat on them. And most of the crowd spread their garments on the way, while others cut down branches from the
9 trees, and spread them on the way. And the crowds, both they that went before him, and they that followed him, kept crying out, 'Hosanna to the son of David: blessed in the name of the Lord is he that cometh. Hosanna in the heights.'

10 And when he was come into Jerusalem, all the city was excited,
11 saying, 'Who is this?' And the crowds said, 'This is the prophet Jesus from Nazareth in Galilee.'

By an odd and almost comical misinterpretation of Zech. ix. 9, Matthew makes Jesus send for two animals, a she-ass and an ass's colt, whereas Zechariah speaks in poetical imagery of one animal under two names. In 7 he makes matters worse by representing Jesus as mounted upon both the she-ass and the foal! The genesis and purport of the whole story are given by Matthew in his express quotation of the passage from Zechariah in verse 4.

8. The leaves or shrubs of Mark are turned here into branches.

9. Matthew supposes 'Hosanna' to mean hail or welcome, a cry of acclamation or greeting. Hence his dative: 'Hail to the Son of David.'

10. Unlike in Mark, Jesus is accompanied by the cheering crowd right into Jerusalem. The city folk are excited, and ask for an explanation of the tumult. It is noticeable that the 'crowds' do not reply 'It is the Messiah,' but, 'It is the [well-known] prophet from Galilee.' Some lay great stress on this. It is supposed to be authentic and highly significant. There is no Messianic entry: Jesus has not claimed to be, and is not described as, the Messiah. He is only the great prophet. Loisy, on the contrary, thinks that the two verses are probably the creation of the Evangelist. As to the phrase in 10, he says: 'The Evangelist chose the wording which appeared to him most in conformity with probability and with the Galilæan antecedents of the preaching of the Gospel; he did not mean that the crowd which had just acclaimed Jesus as Son of David did not regard him as the promised Christ' (*E. S.* II. p. 270).

12–17. THE PURIFICATION OF THE TEMPLE
(*Cp.* Mark xi. 15–19; Luke xix. 45–48)

12 And Jesus went into the temple, and drove out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the
13 moneychangers, and the seats of them that sold doves. And he said unto them, 'It is written, My house shall be called a house of prayer; but ye make it a den of thieves.'

14 And blind and lame folk came to him in the temple; and he
15 healed them. And when the chief priests and scribes saw the wonderful things that he did, and the children crying out in the temple, and saying, 'Hosanna to the son of David,' they were indig-
16 nant. And they said unto him, 'Hearest thou what these say?' And Jesus said unto them, 'Yes; have ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast prepared praise?'

17 And he left them, and went out of the city into Bethany; and he passed the night there.

12. Matthew omits here the first part of Mark's story of the barren fig tree, and passes on at once to the purification of the temple, which in his narrative follows immediately after the entry. It is just possible that this order is historical, and answers to the oldest record. Matthew may here, says Loisy, have possibly been helped 'by the source of Mark' (*E. S.* I. p. 133).

14–16. Matthew only. It would scarcely appear as if these verses were taken from a good source. They may indeed be the creation of the Evangelist; he is fond of healings and may have added these, 'pour rehausser la situation,' as Loisy says. In Mark there are no healings in Jerusalem. Perhaps Matthew thought Mark xi. 18 premature, and replaced it by another incident more suitable to the occasion.

15. The chief priests and scribes do not complain of the purification, but of the healings and of the acclamations of the children. They will speak of the purification incident on the morrow. This is awkward and unlikely.

16. Jesus, by his answer, indirectly admits his Messiahship. If the joyous cries of infants are a praise of God, there is nothing improper in the homage rendered by the children in the Temple to God's messenger. 'Jésus prouve ainsi que cette manifestation des enfants est conforme à la volonté de Dieu, et il donne à entendre qu'elle répond également à une intention de sa providence' (*E. S.* II. p. 280).

18–22. THE FIG TREE

(*Cp.* Mark xi. 12–14, 20–26)

18 Now in the morning, as he returned into the city, he was
19 hungry. And seeing a fig tree by the wayside, he went up to
it, but found nothing on it except leaves. And he said unto
it, 'No more shall fruit come from thee for ever.' And immedi-
20 ately the fig tree withered away. And when the disciples saw
it, they marvelled, saying, 'How instantly the fig tree withered
21 away!' Jesus answered and said unto them, 'Verily I say unto
you, If ye have faith, and doubt not, ye shall not only do what
has been done to the fig tree, but also if ye should say unto this
mountain, Lift thyself up, and hurl thyself into the sea, it would

22 come to pass. And all things whatever that ye ask for in prayer, if ye have faith, ye shall receive.'

19. Matthew joins together the two separated parts of the story in Mark. The marvel is made more marvellous by happening at once. The symbolic meaning or moral of the incident is then explained. The adage on faith occurs also in xvii. 20. There Matthew appears to have quoted it from Q; here he closely follows Mark. But the passage in Mark may also go back to Q. So Loisy, *E. S.* II. pp. 288–290; Weiss, *Quellen*, A, p. 189, B, p. 67.

23–27. THE AUTHORITY OF JOHN

(*Cp.* Mark xi. 27–33; Luke xx. 1–8)

23 And when he had come into the temple, the chief priests and
the elders of the people came up to him as he was teaching, and
said, 'By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave
24 thee this authority?' And Jesus answered and said unto them,
'I also will ask you one question, which if ye tell me, I too will
25 tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of
John, whence was it? from heaven, or from men?' And they
argued with themselves, saying, 'If we say, From heaven, he will
26 say unto us, Why then did ye not believe him? But if we say,
From men, we fear the people; for they all hold John to be
27 a prophet.' So they answered Jesus, and said, 'We do not
know.' And he said unto them, 'Neither do I tell you by what
authority I do these things.

23. Jesus is represented as teaching, as is usual in Matthew. In spite of the immediate appearance of this verse and the next, the question of the priests must relate to Jesus's purification of the Temple, and not to his teaching. So Loisy, as against W., who says that ταῦτα must here mean, 'woher Jesus die Befugniss habe zu lehren,' and against Holtzmann, who refers it to the miraculous healings which Jesus had wrought on the previous day. But both these explanations are unnecessary. 'Il s'agit toujours de l'autorité que Jésus s'est arrogée dans le temple depuis son arrivée, et dont l'expulsions des vendeurs a été l'affirmation la plus hardie' (*E. S.* II. p. 294).

28–32. The Parable of the Two Sons

(Matthew only)

28 ‘But what think ye? A man had two sons; and he came to
29 the first, and said, Son, go and work to-day in the vineyard. He
answered and said, I will not: but afterwards he repented, and
30 went. And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he
31 answered and said, I go, sir; but he went not. Which of the two
did the will of his father?’ They said unto him, ‘The first.’
Jesus said unto them, ‘Verily I say unto you, The tax-collectors
32 and the harlots go before you into the kingdom of God. For
John brought unto you the way of righteousness, and ye believed
him not: but the tax-collectors and the harlots believed him:
and ye, though ye saw it, repented not afterwards, so as to
believe him.

28. The parable was once probably not connected with the preceding paragraph. Though only the last verse has its parallel in Luke (vii. 29, 30), the parable may be taken from Q and belong to the section about the status of John, following on xi. 12–15. *Cp.* Weiss, *Quellen*, A, pp. 65–67, and B, pp. 18, 19, for the form in which the section may perhaps have had in Q.

W. makes the important remark that the religious relation between man and God usually appears in Matthew as service, not as sonship. The king or the householder stands usually on the one side; his servants upon the other. Here, instead of king or master, we have father and sons. But the sons must also serve, if willingly. W.’s remark is important, because it helps to show that the contrast which some German Protestant theologians delight to expand—that to the Jews God is a King, to the Christians a Father—is a made-up contrast, which caricatures and misinterprets the facts.

31. There is considerable variety in the MSS. Some turn the position of the sons round, and make the son who says ‘Yes’ answer first. Moreover the MSS. which the Authorised Version and Revised Version follow make the chief priests give the obvious answer; but other MSS. read ὁ ὕστερος: *i.e.* they make the priests say that the son who did the will of his father was he who promised, but did not perform. M. Loisy points out that the usual reading is, after all, by far the more probable. I agree with him. Only if the first son had said ‘No’ would the father have asked the second. The parable and its application in 31 are simple and clear.

The other reading is, however, defended by some scholars. We can best explain it by supposing, not that even the Evangelist meant to represent the chief priests as so ethically obtuse as to believe that a promise unfulfilled was better than refusal and performance; but that, knowing the obvious reply which Jesus expected, they deliberately answered wrong. Whatever the moral which Jesus intended to draw, whatever the application he intended to make, from the parable, they would spoil his argument by making an absurd reply. Jesus, all the same, says what he had all along meant to say; he can, however, only say it, not as an explanation of the parable, but as an indignant assertion. Merx earnestly defends the reading (of the S.S.) just mentioned (*i.e.* that the Pharisees said that the man who said I will go, but did not go, fulfilled the will of his father), but on peculiar grounds and with a peculiar interpretation.

He holds that the story is intended as a deadly, but most accurate satire upon the debased morality of the Scribes who keep the letter and neglect the spirit.

This is a tremendous indictment upon the moral teaching and upon the moral character of the Rabbis. Merx attempts to substantiate the charge, but his attempt is a failure. His proof is entirely taken from a few passages in the Mishnah which make a distinction in legal dealing between Israelite and foreigner. Now it must be freely admitted that the Rabbis did make such a distinction. It is the weak spot, not merely in their legislation, but in their general religious point of view. But it would be just as unfair to deduce from this that in all other respects they observed the letter and neglected the spirit as it would be to say that because millions of Christians have believed that non-Christians or heretical Christians would go to Hell, therefore these same persons were not within their own community loving and just and truthful. It is untrue that the Rabbis as a class did not observe the spirit of the Law or did not fulfil God's will. If Jesus said any such thing, he was guilty of the usual exaggeration of the partisan and the reformer. With the utmost confidence Merx may be defied to prove his case.

But Merx admits that in reality the Rabbis could not have made the absurd reply with which they are credited. He therefore supposes that the passage is a satire, not a record. The story did not happen as it is reported to have happened.

It is to be noticed that in a passage which is not taken from Mark, we find Kingdom of God, and not Kingdom of heaven. Why is this? Mr Allen's explanation is ingenious. 'In "go before you into the Kingdom" the meaning is not so much, "will go before you into the Kingdom when it is inaugurated," as "obey

God by fulfilling John's command to repent, submit to the divine will, take upon yourselves the yoke of the Kingdom and become heirs of its promises." In other words, the Kingdom here means rather the condition of preparedness for the coming Kingdom than that future Kingdom itself. Had the Evangelist written, "will go before you into the Kingdom of the heavens," he would have represented the Lord as foretelling the future admission of the people to whom he was speaking into the Kingdom. This was just what the editor wished to avoid. They were to be cast out of the Kingdom (viii. 12). "Go before you into the Kingdom," on the other hand, emphasizes the fact that the toll-gatherers and harlots go, and leaves it quite ambiguous whether the persons addressed "go" or not.' Thus the editor 'may have felt that the Kingdom of God of his source was not quite the same as the Kingdom of the heavens which he elsewhere describes.' Hence Mr Allen has to assume that the source contained both the expression Kingdom of God and Kingdom of the heavens, and that the former 'was used in a sense not always identical with the latter.' Is not this somewhat too subtle a theory? Jesus uses the words 'go before you' loosely. The ultimate entry of the others into the Kingdom is not really thought of at all.

32. *Cp.* Luke vii. 29, 30. This verse is made to give the explanation of the parable in its present setting. But it fits very awkwardly. For the 'tax-collectors and harlots,' so far as we know, did not at first refuse to believe in John, and then afterwards believe in him and amend their lives; nor did the priests first believe in him and then reject him. And it would be strained to say that the Priests are compared with the good son by contraries. He said No, but went; they were not even moved by the example of the tax-collectors and the harlots. This strained interpretation is, however, to all appearance, the explanation of the parable suggested by verse 32. 'Ye seeing [what the tax-collectors, &c., did] did not even then change your minds so as to believe in him.' M. Loisy supposes that verse 31 *b* drew to it verse 32, and then the whole paragraph, thus constituted, was given a place after xxi. 25–27. The mention of John in xxi. 25 seemed to justify putting 28–32 after 27. But 32 must have existed originally independently of the parable.

Hence we may also infer that the parable itself had originally a much more general meaning. And if it stood in the 'source,' where Weiss thinks, it was not even then in its right place (*cp.* Loisy, II. p. 301, n. 3). It is very strained to suppose that the Scribes, who pretended to be ever ready to do God's will, and refused to obey the first demand of that will (*i.e.* John's baptism), are represented by the elder son. The parable has more aptly been called a popular sermon on the text of Matt. vii. 21. The bad son who promises but does not perform represents the priests and elders and Scribes who make professions (and observe outward rites), but are inwardly bad, and live immoral lives. The good son, who first refuses and then performs, represents the 'multitude,' the outcasts, &c., who, through the agency of John and Jesus, have changed their lives or are better than their appearance. The historical value of the charge need not be again examined here. That Jesus underestimated the ethical and religious worth of his opponents and exaggerated their faults was natural and human. The only odd thing is that serious historians should not take his charges with many grains of salt, and allow for the invariable exaggerations and perversions of controversy and antagonism.

Mr Allen's explanation is rather awkward. Jesus, according to him, 'applies the answer of the authorities to their own conduct by way of contrast. They had said that that son was to be approved who, though he was unwilling at first, yet afterwards went into the vineyard. But the Baptist came preaching righteousness, calling men to go into God's vineyard through the gate of repentance, and they had given no ear to his preaching. In this respect they were like the first son of the parable who said "I am unwilling." But, unlike him, they had not afterwards repented and obeyed the Baptist's call. On the other hand, the toll-gatherers and the harlots had also been like the first son, but they had changed their minds when John preached, and had obeyed the call. This only hardened the Jewish authorities the more. A vineyard in which outcasts worked was no vineyard for them. A kingdom into which the toll-gatherers could enter was no kingdom for them. Thus toll-gatherers and harlots went before them into the Kingdom of God.' Merx as usual follows the S.S. and renders: 'But you, when you saw, repented that you had been inclined to believe in him,' (or 'had almost believed in him'). The Greek is difficult. The infinitive should be present and not aorist in order to translate 'did not repent so as to believe,' while 'did not repent of having believed' makes no sense. For the Pharisees had *not* believed (Allen).

With truth Havet points out that the words in this verse go much beyond what is said about sinners in Mark (ii. 17). 'Ce n'est là qu'une amère insulte adressée au judaisme, dans une temps sans doute où le judaisme était détesté' (*Le Christianisme et ses origines*, IV. p. 58).

ἐν, 'he came with righteousness': *i.e.* he brought righteousness. The way is the manner and method. John represented and stood for the manner of life which righteousness demands (Allen).

John came preaching righteousness, the truth of the coming Kingdom, and salvation through sincere repentance (Loisy).

33–46. The Parable of the Vineyard

(*Cp.* Mark xii. 1–12; Luke xx. 9–19)

33 'Hear another parable: There was a householder, who planted
a vineyard, and set an hedge around it, and dug out a winepress in
it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went
34 abroad. And when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his
35 servants to the husbandmen to receive the fruits of it. And the
husbandmen seized his servants, and beat one, and killed another,
36 and stoned another. Again, he sent other servants, more in
number than the first: and they treated them in the same way.
37 But later still he sent unto them his son, saying, They will have
38 respect for my son. But when the husbandmen saw the son, they
said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and
39 seize his inheritance. And they laid hold of him, and cast him out
40 of the vineyard, and slew him. When then the lord of the vineyard
41 cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen?' They said
unto him, 'He will put those wicked men to an evil death, and
the vineyard he will let out unto other husbandmen, who will pay
42 him the fruits in their seasons.' Jesus said unto them, 'Have ye
never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected
is become the corner-stone: this is the Lord's doing, and it is
43 marvellous in our eyes? Therefore I say unto you, The kingdom
of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing
forth its fruits.'

45 And when the chief priests and Pharisees heard his parables,
46 they realized that he spoke of them. And they sought to take
him prisoner, but they feared the people, because they regarded
him as a prophet.

39. In Matthew they kill the heir outside the vineyard, which may be an allusion to the crucifixion of Jesus outside Jerusalem. But Dr Carpenter thinks this forced and unnecessary.

41. The priests and elders are made to pronounce the sentence upon themselves and Israel from their own mouths.

43. Matthew only. The Kingdom is taken away from the Jews, and given to 'another people.' By this 'other people,' W. says, it is possible to understand both Jewish as well as Gentile Christians, for ἔθνος has here a moral and not a national connotation.

The right fruits of the vineyard are the same as in Isaiah: righteousness and love. These the Christian believers will render to their Lord (41).

'The Kingdom' is here used in a somewhat peculiar sense. It is not only present, but actually in the possession of the Jews. 'In the people of Israel, which lived according to God's law and recognized Him as its King, the Kingdom was in a certain sense already realized. Kingdom is thus here much the same as theocracy.' When Matthew wrote, the doom had fallen. The Jews had been rejected in the sack and ruin of Jerusalem. The Kingdom had been taken away from them (J. Weiss). The whole parable is surely later than Jesus, and indeed later than 70 A.D. Mr Allen rightly discusses the question why in a verse added by the editor to his source, which here is Mark, he has put "Kingdom of God" instead of his usual "Kingdom of the heavens." 'The vineyard was to be taken from the Jewish nation, but what term could the editor substitute for the vineyard? What he wished to express was, no doubt, the privileged position of the Jews as the recipients of a Divine revelation. But this was just what the Rabbinical writers express by the "sovereignty of the heavens." When a heathen became a proselyte, and was incorporated into the privileged Jewish people, he was said to take upon himself the sovereignty of the heavens; see Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 97. We might therefore have expected the editor to use the phrase "Kingdom of heaven." But since he has throughout this Gospel' [as Mr Allen thinks] 'employed this term for the eschatological Kingdom which Christ announced, and which was to be inaugurated when the Son of man came upon the clouds of heaven, it would have been unsuitable here. For that Kingdom had never been the possession of the Jewish rulers and could not be taken from them. The phrase "Kingdom of God," in the sense current among the Jews of the 1st century A.D., of sovereignty of God, seemed more suitable here, and the editor, by using it, once more betrays his Jewish origin, and emphasizes his sense of the difference between this phrase in his Gospel and the more frequent "Kingdom of heaven."' It is doubtful whether this ingenious theory will hold the field.

46. They regarded him as a prophet. Once more this aspect of Jesus is emphasized. *Cp.* verse 11.

CHAPTER XXII

1-14. THE PARABLE OF THE MESSIANIC BANQUET

(*Cp.* Luke xiv. 16-24)

1 And Jesus answered and spake unto them again in parables,
2 saying, 'The kingdom of heaven is like unto a king, who made
3 a marriage-feast for his son. And he sent forth his servants
to call those who had been invited to the marriage-feast: and
4 they would not come. Again, he sent forth other servants, saying,
Tell them who have been invited, Behold, I have prepared my
dinner: my oxen and my fatlings are killed, and all is ready:
5 come unto the marriage-feast. But they gave no heed, and went
6 away, one to his field, another to his business. And the rest seized
7 his servants, and ill-treated them, and slew them. But the king
was wroth: and he sent forth his armies, and destroyed those
8 murderers, and burned their city. Then said he to his servants,
The marriage-feast is ready, but they who were invited were not
9 worthy. Go ye, then, to the cross-roads, and whomever ye find,
10 invite to the marriage-feast. So those servants went out into the
highways, and collected all whom they found, both bad and good;
11 and the marriage hall was filled with guests. And when the king
came in to look at the guests, he saw there a man who was
12 not clad with a wedding garment: and he said unto him, Friend,
how camest thou in hither without a wedding garment? But he
13 was speechless. Then said the king to the servants, Bind him
hand and foot, and cast him into the outer darkness; there shall
14 the weeping be and the gnashing of teeth. For many are invited,
but few are chosen.'

The more original form of the parable is in Luke. If it was spoken by Jesus, which can neither be proved nor disproved, it had the same moral and intention as the parable in Mark xii. 1–12. The 'Kingdom' would be taken away from the professing and leading Jews, and given to the νήπιοι, the humble and despised 'multitude,' the repentant sinners, tax-collectors, and outcasts. *Cp.* Matt. xi. 25. The difficulty about all this is the grave doubt which arises as to its relation to historical fact. In Galilee, and to a less extent in Judæa, there probably was, at that time, an outcast fringe, a neglected minority, a submerged tenth, but the evidence, such as it is, does not point to this fringe being a big one. (See Additional Note 43.) The real 'multitude' was in sympathy with the Scribes, and observed the Law. The Scribes were themselves not drawn, for the greater part, from the 'nobles,' but from the common people. Even in their supposed original form I doubt whether these parables reflect the historical situation, and therefore I doubt whether parables which seem to oppose the Scribes to the multitude were really spoken by Jesus. J. Weiss, on the other hand, believes that those who are here alluded to are not the 'outcast' Jews, but the heathen. Harnack thinks that in Matthew two parables have been mingled together. The second parable told of a king, whose subjects revolted behind his back and who took a terrible vengeance. Whether the parable even as Luke has it stood in Q is doubtful.

1. Matthew's setting for the parable is awkward. Jesus continues to speak to 'them' in parables, but 'they' to whom the Evangelist would have us understand that the parable was spoken have really left the stage. Yet we may notice that in his reproduction of Mark xii. 12, Matthew does, at all events (xxi. 45, 46), omit definitely to say that the priests and Pharisees 'left him and went away.'

2. The banquet of the original parable (and, as some would say, of Q) is turned by Matthew into a wedding feast prepared by a king. Moreover it is given for his son.

The Messianic Kingdom and beatitude were often represented under the figure of a banquet. In Matthew's wedding feast the Messiah is the bridegroom; the Christian community should be the bride. But this part of the figure is dropped: the guests take the place of the bride.

3–5. The many servants sent out to call the guests may be the prophets. And the fresh servants of 4 may be John and Jesus, even although Jesus is the son. Or the fresh servants may be the apostles. A *general* reference of the *main* incidents of the parable to historic circumstances is all that must be looked for. And a certain amount of confusion was inevitable in the gradual formation of the parable as we now possess it. The words in 4 are modelled on Prov. ix. 2–3, 5.

6, 7. Later verses. The reference is to the rebellious Jews who reject the message of Jesus and John and kill them. Their city is Jerusalem, which is burnt. The date of these verses is clearly after 70. The insertion is very incongruous. After the city is burnt, the king continues the wedding feast as if nothing had happened. Did he not live in his own city? And where did the new guests come from if the city is destroyed?

8 connects with 5, when 6 and 7, the later insertions, are omitted.

10. 'Bad and good' is an addition of Matthew, whereby he prepares the reader for his appendix 11–14. Matthew often alludes to the mixed moral condition of the Church of his time.

11–13. An unsuitable addition. If the guests were to be brought in, almost pell-mell, from the streets and roads, how could they be expected to have wedding dresses on? Matthew wants to imply that in the Christian community itself there will be a sifting at the Judgment Day. Only those whose works are good will be admitted into the perfected Kingdom. The key to the incongruous use of the wedding garment in 11 Pfleiderer finds in Rev. xix. 8, where the Christian community, as the bride of Christ, is arrayed in fine linen, and the fine linen is declared to be the 'righteous acts of the saints.' Faith is not enough. There must also be Works. This again is a Church compromise. 'Es ist der *ethisch* bedingte Universalismus, diese kirchliche Wendung des dogmatisch begründeten paulinischen Universalismus, was der kirchliche Evangelist hier, wie in den eschatologischen Gleichnissen Kp. 25, ausdrückt' (*Urchristentum*, Vol. I. p. 590). The wording is no longer appropriate to the parable. For the outer darkness and the gnashing of teeth can only refer to hell. Matthew agrees with the original parable in so far as the excluded Scribes and Pharisees are concerned. But those who remain in it finally are what he is concerned to point out, and these are not especially the sinners and the tax-collectors, the humble and the afflicted, but those who are righteous in deed as well as in name—true disciples of the great Master. For many listened gladly to his teaching and became disciples in name, but only a small selection of these are disciples in very deed and will enter into 'the joy of their Lord.'

14. This verse only suits 11–13, not the main portion of the parable. The mournful and unloving doctrine prepared the way for the particularism of dogmatic Christianity. But here it has one saving characteristic: the test of admission is action and not belief. Some think that Jesus became more pessimistic towards the close of his ministry. Though the saying is an addition to the parable, it may nevertheless be in itself authentic. 'Many are invited, few are chosen.' The word 'called' is the participle of the verb used for 'invite' in the body of the parable. By 'called' or 'invited' Matthew does not merely mean 'have heard the summons,' but 'through the preaching of the Gospel have become members of the Church.' Of these members only a small minority shall partake of the full salvation of the perfected Kingdom of Heaven. 'How great must the corruption of the Church have been in Matthew's eyes, how luxuriant the growth of the tares, if he ventured to assert that the just and the chosen should be so few!' If Jesus used the adage, he could only have meant by it: 'Many hear the summons to repentance and salvation, but only few are predestined by God to respond to it. Thus perhaps his ill success was explained by him.' It was necessary, within the purposes of God. His business was to find out the chosen few. (J. Weiss.) The adage itself is paralleled by, and perhaps goes back to, the mournful and irreligious saying in 4 Ezra (2 Esdras): 'Many are created, but few shall be saved' (viii. 3).

15–22. GIVE UNTO CÆSAR

(*Cp.* Mark xii. 13–17; Luke xx. 20–26)

15 Then went the Pharisees, and formed a resolution that they
16 would entrap him in his talk. And they sent unto him their
disciples with the Herodians, saying, 'Master, we know that thou
art truthful, and teachest the way of God in truth, and that thou
hast regard for no man: for thou respectest not the person of men.
17 So tell us: What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto
18 the Emperor, or not?' But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and
19 said, 'Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? Show me the tribute
20 money.' And they brought unto him a silver coin. And he said
21 unto them, 'Whose is this image and superscription?' They said
unto him, 'The Emperor's.' Then said he unto them, 'Pay, then,
to the Emperor what is the Emperor's, and unto God what is God's.'
22 When they had heard this, they marvelled, and left him, and went
their way.

15, 16. Mark had left the subject of 'they sent' uncertain. Matthew makes the Pharisees the subject. So, as they cannot send themselves, they have to send 'disciples' (W.).

19. The tribute had to be paid in Roman money. Hence Jesus asks for the 'tribute money.'

23–33. THE RESURRECTION-LIFE

(*Cp.* Mark xii. 18–27; Luke xx. 27–38)

23 The same day there came to him some Sadducees, who say that
24 there is no resurrection, and they asked him, saying, 'Master,
Moses said, If a man die, having no children, his brother must
25 marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. Now there
were among us seven brothers: and the first married and died,
26 and, having no issue, left his wife unto his brother: so too the
27 second and the third, unto the seventh. And last of all the woman
28 died. In the resurrection, then, whose wife shall she be of the
29 seven? for they all had her.' Jesus answered and said unto them,
30 'Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures or the power of God. For
in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage,
31 but are as angels of God in heaven. But as regards the resurrection
of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by
32 God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and
the God of Jacob? He is not the God of the dead, but of the
33 living.' And when the people heard this, they were astounded at
his teaching.

24. The quotation is taken from Gen. xxxviii. 8 rather than from Deut. xxiv. 5.

25. In Mark, the questioners imply that the case is made up for the occasion; in Matthew, by the addition of the words παρ' ἡμῖν, 'with us,' it is implied that it actually occurred.

34–40. THE GREATEST COMMANDMENT

(*Cp.* Mark xii. 28–34; Luke x. 25–28)

34 But when the Pharisees heard that he had put the Sadducees
35 to silence, they gathered together. Then one of them, a teacher
36 of the Law, tempting him, asked him: 'Master, which is the great

37 commandment in the Law?' Jesus said unto him, 'Thou shalt
love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul,
38 and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment.
39 And a second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as
40 thyself. On these two commandments hang the whole Law and
the Prophets.'

Matthew's version of the story is prejudiced. The Pharisees had left the stage (xxii. 22), but here they return. The Rabbi is put up by them to question Jesus and 'tempt' him. For here the 'testing' is meant to be a temptation. In what the 'temptation' consisted Matthew might have found it hard to say. But to his mind no question could be put by any Scribe or Pharisee honestly or without a bad motive. Matthew omits the whole second half of the story in which Jesus and the Rabbi express their mutual satisfaction with each other. As W. says: 'gleich als ob er einen unparteiischen und verständigen Rabbi sich nicht vorstellen könnte.' It is pleasant to find W. saying as much as this. It is to be noted that both Matthew and Luke show an odd correspondence: both use the word διδάσκαλε, both use the word νομικός (elsewhere not found in this passage), both speak of the questioner as 'trying' or 'testing' Jesus. Hence both seem to have also used another redaction of the story over and above Mark. So Loisy and B. Weiss. This version was perhaps Q, and Q was perhaps also used by Mark. The question then is, did Q present the question as asked with an unkindly intent. In spite of the introduction or setting given by Matthew, Loisy thinks that we can explain πειράζων, as used by Q, in a non-hostile sense. The Scribe is curious to know how Jesus will treat a difficult problem, he wants to test his knowledge, 'non l'exposer à une condamnation capitale.' Q therefore uses πειράζων in a friendly sense, Matthew in a hostile sense. We see the original meaning of 'trying' in the version of Luke. The words at the end of verse 34, 'they gathered together' (literally, 'assembled at the same place'), are taken from Psalm ii. 3, and are quoted in the Acts (iv. 26) as a Messianic prophecy. Matthew intensifies the hostility of the Pharisees to prepare the reader for the long diatribe against them shortly to follow (*E. S.* II. pp. 348, 349).

41–46. Whose Son is the Messiah?

(*Cp.* Mark xii. 35–37; Luke xx. 40–44)

41 While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them,
42 saying, 'What think ye about the Messiah? whose son is he?'
43 They said unto him, 'David's.' He said unto them, 'How then

44 doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy
45 footstool? If, then, David call him Lord, how is he his son?'
46 And no man was able to answer him a word, neither did anyone from that day venture to question him again.

41. The Pharisees appear again: thus the last words of Mark xii. 34 are transferred to xxii. 46, although in this section Jesus is not asked, but asks. Matthew also, more dramatically, makes the Pharisees themselves state, in answer to Jesus's question, that the Messiah is the son of David.

CHAPTER XXIII

1–36. ATTACK UPON THE PHARISEES

(*Cp.* Mark xii. 38–40; Luke xx. 45–47, xi. 39–42, 44, 46–52)

2 Then spoke Jesus to the people, and to his disciples, saying,
3 'The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all, then, that
they say to you, that do and observe; but do not do according to
4 their works: for they say, and do not. For they bind heavy
burdens, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves
5 will not move them with one of their fingers. They do all their
works to be seen of men: for they make broad their phylacteries,
6 and enlarge the tassels. And they love the first places at banquets,
7 and the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the market-
8 places, and to be called by men, Rabbi. But be not ye called
9 Rabbi: for one is your Master, and ye are all brothers. And call
no man your father upon earth: for one is your Father, who is in
10 heaven. [Neither be ye called leaders: for one is your Leader,
11 even the Christ.] But he that is greatest among you shall be
12 your servant. And whoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled;
and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted.

13 'But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, nor allow them that would enter to go in.

15 'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pass over sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he becometh one, ye make him a child of hell twice as much as yourselves.

16 'Woe unto you, blind guides, who say, Whoever sweareth by the temple, it is nothing; but whoever sweareth by the gold of the

17 temple, he is bound by his oath. Fools and blind! for which is
18 greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold? And
(ye say) Whoever sweareth by the altar, it is nothing; but whoever sweareth by the sacrifice that is upon it, he is bound by his
19 oath. Fools and blind! for which is greater, the sacrifice, or the
20 altar that sanctifieth the sacrifice? Who therefore sweareth by the
21 altar, sweareth by it, and by all that is on it. And who sweareth
by the temple, sweareth by it, and by Him that dwelleth in it.
22 And he that sweareth by heaven, sweareth by the throne of God,
and by Him that sitteth upon it.

23 'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay
tithe from mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the
weightiest things of the Law, justice, mercy, and faith: these
24 ought ye to do, though not to leave the others undone. Blind
guides, who strain out a gnat, and swallow a camel.

25 'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye clean
the outside of the cup and of the plate, but within they are full of
26 extortion and incontinence. Blind Pharisee, clean first that which
is within the cup, that the outside of it may become clean also.

27 'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are
like unto whited sepulchres, which outwardly appear beautiful,
but within are full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness.
28 Even so ye too outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within
ye are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness.

29 'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye
build the tombs of the prophets, and adorn the sepulchres of the
30 righteous. And ye say, If we had lived in the days of our fathers,
we should not have been partners with them in the blood of the
31 prophets. So that ye witness unto yourselves, that ye are the
32 children of them who killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the
33 measure of your fathers. Serpents, offspring of vipers, how can
ye escape from being condemned unto hell?

34 'Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men,
and scribes: some of them ye will kill and crucify; and some of
them ye will scourge in your synagogues, and pursue them from
35 city to city: so that upon you may come all the righteous blood
which hath been shed upon the land from the blood of Abel the
righteous unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye

36 slew between the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation.

The parallel in Mark for this long diatribe is xii. 38–40, three verses in all. Luke is longer, xi. 37–52. The speech not only contains much which must be later than Jesus, but there is little of it which can with good show of probability be attributed to him. In its unhistoric violence it overreaches itself. I doubt whether Jesus, even in the heat of controversy, would have made such sweeping assertions. The scource of the speech both Loisy and B. Weiss take to be Q, from whom Mark has drawn (perhaps from memory) the few verses, by way of abstract and illustration, which he gives in his twelfth chapter. 'Matthieu,' in Loisy's opinion, 'a glosé le texte des Logia, soit de lui-même, soit au moyen de pièces rapportées' (*E. S.* I. p. 134). If the speech was in Q, and if Mark read it there, the chances of its authenticity become, I admit, greater, but I still think it more probable than not that its greater portion is unjustly ascribed to Jesus.

2. 'The Scribes and the Pharisees' is a sort of loose expression for the 'Pharisaic Scribes.' The 'Pharisees' were really a very big section of the entire population. The 'Scribes' were their religious leaders; they only could be said to sit on Moses' seat.

B. Weiss indeed supposes that in Q it was *οἱ νομικοί*, the Men of the Law who were declared to sit upon Moses' seat, and not the Scribes and the Pharisees. Much of the speech is really directed against them. 'Dass ihre rein rhetorischen Apostrophen aber alle an die Schriftgelehrten und Pharisäer gerichtet sind, ist ein offenbarer Irrtum von Matth., der diese beiden stets am liebsten als die Gegner Jesu bezeichnet, da aus der von Luk. komponierten Zwischenfrage xi. 45 erhellt, dass ihm in beiden Quellen (Q und L) neben den Strafreden wider die Pharisäer auch solche gegen die *νομικοί* vorlagen. So ja gleich xxiii. 2, da auf dem Lehrstuhl Mosis gar nicht die Pharisäer, nicht einmal die zünftigen *γραμματεῖς* sassen, sondern lediglich die eigentlichen Gesetzeslehrer' (*Quellen*, B, p. 40).

Are verses 2 and 3 irreconcileable with xv. 3–14? Holtzmann thinks they are. They are the work of the Evangelist with his special respect for the Law, and are of the same spirit as v. 17–19. Pfleiderer thinks that this is not necessarily the case. He seems inclined to hold that the utterances of 3 and 23 *b* might be taken to refer to the written Mosaic and Pentateuchal Law only. So far as the Scribes, sitting in Moses' seat, taught the Mosaic Law they were to be obeyed. This limitation is, however, not quite easy. It is true that Jesus as a general rule did not attack, and was not conscious of attacking, the *Pentateuchal* or Mosaic Law. But the

Rabbinic developments of the Pentateuch were also taught by the Rabbis as Mosaic. They were either supposed to have been orally handed down from the age of Moses, or regarded as the necessary complements of the written code. It is more probable that if xxiii. 3 goes back to Jesus, the contradictions between it and other passages (such as those about divorce, &c.) are due to different moods and sentiments having been prominent in Jesus at different times. And nothing can be better, I think, than the following sentences in which Pfleiderer sums up his results: 'Thus scarcely any other conclusion remains than to admit that in the attitude of Jesus towards the Mosaic Law different expressions which cannot be reconciled stand side by side, the most natural explanation of which may be found in a change of mood, similar to that which is known to have been the case with other epoch-making heroes, such for example as Luther. In the exalted moments of prophetic inspiration, enthusiastic hope for a new world and passionate battling with the realities of everyday life, Jesus now and again felt himself inwardly taken beyond the legal barriers of his people, so that he could feel forward (*ahnen*) to the time when the validity of the Law should end. But from that to a conscious breach with the Law there was still a long step, which Jesus himself never took; it was reserved for his apostle Paul to take it' (*Urchristentum*, I. p. 659). On the other hand, M. Loisy attacks the authenticity. The passage, he thinks, is in harmony neither with the spirit of the whole attack upon the Pharisees (which, purged of glosses, he thinks, goes back to Jesus) nor with the Evangelist. The latter did not perceive the contradiction because the injunction is immediately followed by an attack. But he who spoke of 'heavy burdens' did not regard all the teaching of the Pharisees as obligatory. This is not what Jesus thought of the Scribes of his time. A judaizing redactor has been at work (*E. S.* II. p. 369). As regards the last words of verse 3, B. Weiss says: 'Ob xxiii. 3 *b* in Q stand ist mir zweifelhaft, da der dort gebildete Gegensatz mit den *νομικοί* gar nichts zu tun hat, und der Beginn der Strafrede auf etwas ganz anderes hinauswill' (*Quellen*, B, p. 40). Verses 2 and 3 have no parallel in Luke.

4. *Cp.* Luke xi. 46. Apparently this means: by their many ordinances they create burdens which they compel others to bear; but they do not bear these burdens, *i.e.* they do not observe these ordinances themselves. This seems dubiously consistent with 23, and is probably inaccurate. It is a fine sign of better things, and of a nascent impartiality which does him high honour, that Oskar Holtzmann says of this and other attacks upon the Pharisees: 'Das sind Kampfreden, die ebenso hyperbolisch sind, wie wenn Jesus sagt,

dass die Pharisäer Mücken seihen und Kameele verschlucken.... Wenn die Führer der Pharisäer wirklich mit keinem Finger an die Lasten gerührt hätten, die sie andern auflegen wollten, so hätten sie schwerlich die Ehre und den Einfluss gewonnen die sie tatsächlich gehabt haben' (*Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, p. 209). B. Weiss gives a quite different explanation which is perhaps worth quoting: the *νομικοί* by their additions to and explanations of the Pentateuchal laws impose heavy burdens upon men, but they (the lawyers) do not in the least help them to fulfil their obligations (*Quellen*, A, p. 265).

5. Matthew only. They are hypocritical and self-righteous; vain and proud. Some of the Scribes probably were; certainly not the Scribes as a class. But opponents never discriminate: each side tars the other with the same big black brush. The reference to Rabbinic customs is explained in Additional Note 48.

6. For 6 *cp.* Mark xii. 38, 39; Luke xx. 46.

8. B. Weiss supposes that 8–12 are inserted here by Matthew from another connection. They belong really to the 'Rangstreitrede'; and should probably find a place after xviii. 3. Though an interpolation here, they are nevertheless taken from Q.

Jesus alone is to be called Rabbi. Elsewhere in Matthew (and Luke) the title is already too meagre for him, and is often replaced by 'Lord' (W.). (But Dr Carpenter notices that *κύριε* may sometimes mean no more than 'sir,' as perhaps in Mark vii. 28.) The disciples occupy the place of Rabbis, for they are to be teachers and preachers. But they are not to call themselves Rabbi, for all followers of Christ are on an equality. All are brothers. A later addition to the oration according to M. Loisy. In his ministry, Jesus had not to warn his disciples against the idea of calling themselves Rabbi or Father; 'c'est dans l'Église naissante que le danger des maîtrises diverses s'est manifesté.' There may even be a hidden attack on Paul. *Cp.* 1 Cor. iv. 15 (*E. S.* II. p. 371).

9. Nor are the disciples to call any one Father, for only God is their Father; perhaps, however, the right reading is, they are not to allow others to call them Father, and this seems more in place here.

10. Is this a mere variant of 8? So W. after Blass. *καθηγητής* means 'leader,' 'master.'

11, 12. *Cp.* Mark ix. 35, x. 44; Matt. xx. 26. True humility shall bring its (heavenly) reward.

13–31. The Seven 'Woes.' Seven is a favourite and holy number.

13. (1) *Cp.* Luke xi. 52. This may mean either, generally, that by their perverse, immoral interpretation of the Law they had made it impossible for those who followed, or sought to follow, their teaching to 'enter the Kingdom,' *i.e.* to be 'saved'; or W. may be right in supposing that it means that the Rabbis prevented Jews from becoming Christians. In this case the 'Kingdom' is the Christian community. M. Loisy would claim the denunciation as authentic. The Scribes did all they could to hinder the preaching of Jesus: they refused to listen themselves, and they tried to prevent others from listening.

14 is interpolated from Mark xii. 40.

15. (2) Matthew only. On W.'s interpretation of 13, 15 presents its converse. They will not let Jews become Christians, but they are keen to make Gentiles Jews.

The charge is exaggerated and unhistorical. The Palestinian Rabbis were, on the whole, not particularly favourable to proselytes. The verse is later than Jesus according to M. Loisy. He suspects a hidden attack on Paul, who really did compass sea and land to make proselytes.

16–22. (3) About oaths. Matthew only. As regards the historical bearing and accuracy of this section see Additional Note 37. Holtzmann characteristically argues that the higher position assigned to the gold ornamentation in the Temple is characteristic of Rabbinic avarice! Loisy denies this, and is inclined to regard the passage as secondary and based upon Matt. v. 34–37.

22. The conception of the 'heaven' as God's throne goes back to Is. lxvi. 1. It is perhaps only meant symbolically.

23. (4) *Cp.* Luke xi. 42. They observe ritual minutiæ, and neglect ethical fundamentals. The word 'heavier,' *βαρύτερα*, is used in a different sense from 'heavy,' *βαρέα*, in verse 4. Here it means the more important, not the more burdensome, portions of the Law.

Matthew is again careful not to allow Jesus to attack the Law itself (here the Law of Tithe). Holtzmann, with a casuistic sharpness, which in a Jewish writer he would call truly 'Rabbinic,' declares that Jesus only uses a *negative* expression for the obligatoriness of the ritual law, 'and these ye should not *neglect*!' But even if this be so, it is significant that the obligatoriness of the ritual law is allowed and maintained. On the other hand, Harnack points out that the last words of the verse are wanting in Luke xi. 42 in the MS. D. They were interpolated from Matthew. They did not exist in Q, but are an addition of Matthew's own. They imply a 'judenchristliche Wertschätzung ceremonialgesetzlicher Bestimmungen.' So too Loisy.

25. (5) *Cp.* Luke xi. 39–41. Inward and outward. The words may mean that they clean dish and cup outwardly, but fill them unrighteously through rapine and avarice. So Loisy. The word *ἀκρασία* means, he says, insatiable appetite, the object of which is here the goods or property of others. He adds: 'Jesus does not pronounce any opinion against legal observances, he no more condemns the Mosaic regulations touching unclean things than he condemned tithes, but he looks upon everything of that kind as quite accessory and even useless without true and inward righteousness. He turns into derision the people who appear to believe that the fruits of their unrighteous deeds can be sanctified by the cleanliness of the vessel in which they put them, whereas the unlawfulness of the acquisition makes superfluous and contaminates the purity of the vessel' (*E. S.* II. p. 379) (*cp.* Mark xii. 40). Or the cup and platter may be a mere metaphor for men. They are outwardly clean, *i.e.* ritually punctilious, but inwardly, in their hearts, they are full of vice. Or, thirdly, as W. thinks, the original meaning of 25 may have been, 'you clean what is outward,' namely, such things as cups and platters, 'but within ye are full of extortion.' This would be a sort of combination of part of the first and second meanings. W. says that if the cups had been meant as a metaphor for men, the dishes would not have been added; and 26, which actually does so interpret the cups, omits the dishes. But 26 implies an old misunderstanding of 25.

26. If the inside is clean, the outside will be counted clean as well.

27, 28. (6) *Cp.* Luke xi. 44. A charge similar to the foregoing. The tombs around Jerusalem used to be whitewashed before Passover so that no ritual impurity might be contracted by stepping upon one unawares. There was no objection to a layman's becoming unclean, except when he wanted to enter the Temple. For the Rabbinic basis of the metaphor see Additional Note 49. Merx would read in 27 as S.S., namely: 'Ye are like sepulchres, which outside are whited, but inside,' &c. He regards 'which seem beautiful' as a gloss, due to misunderstanding of the Jewish custom, which was not intended to make the graves look pretty. The gloss induced the addition of 28.

29. (7) *Cp.* Luke xi. 47, 48. Though this is the seventh Woe, it is, as W. says, unconnected with the previous sections. It could be added because of the 'sepulchres,' which form a verbal link. It is the Jews generally who are here addressed, rather than the Scribes or the Pharisees. Matthew has added the 'Scribes and Pharisees' and also 'ye adorn the sepulchres of the righteous.' So too Harnack. But Loisy thinks the Woe is 'bien à sa place.' The idea is the same as in the parable of the wicked husbandmen.

As to the Rabbinic and historic basis for 29, see Additional Note 50.

30–32. If your fathers had not made martyrs, you could not honour them. You reap the fruits of your fathers' violence, and so prove that you are their true descendants! The argument is ironical, but also rather absurd. It may be implied that the honour shown is mere hypocrisy. 'Es muss schon bei den Juden eine Art Märtyrerkultus bestanden haben. Die grausame Ironie fällt auf, womit er behandelt wird; sie trifft eigentlich den christlichen Märtyrerkultus ebenso gut' (W.).

32. Authorised and Revised Versions render, 'Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers.'

W. interprets: 'Imitate your fathers fully'; *i.e.* murder as they did! And so Loisy: 'They are ready to fill up the measure of the crimes committed before them by delivering up Jesus the Messiah to death.' Merx follows the S.S., 'Ye will fill up the measure of your fathers,' *i.e.* ye will sin as much as they. But the Greek makes a good sense. It is parallel to such expressions as 'the wickedness of the Amorites is not yet full.' Jesus bitterly urges them to fill up the measure of their wickedness, that their doom may come the sooner.

34–36 is the latest part of the whole chapter. *Cp.* Luke xi. 49–51. Jesus is made to predict persecutions of Christian teachers instigated and perpetrated by Jews. *Cp.* x. 17, &c. See notes on Luke xi. 49, where most of this passage is given as a quotation from the 'Wisdom of God.' Harnack thinks it certain that the passage (Matt. xxiii. 34, 35; Luke xi. 49–51) *is* a quotation. Jesus quoted a document which he regarded as inspired. What it was we do not know. Perhaps Matthew did not like to make Jesus quote an apocryphal book. In every other respect Matthew's text is to be preferred. Harnack only allows as additions of Matthew to Q, 'ye will crucify,' and 'ye will scourge in your synagogues,' and 'from city to city' and 'son of Barachias.' No need, he thinks, to assume 'a prophecy after the event.'

Note that Matthew or his source does not scruple to call the Christian teachers 'scribes' as well as prophets and sages. The Jews, who by the ruin of their State and Temple have suffered the ultimate punishment, have suffered justly. They not only bear the punishment for all former generations of prophet-slayers, but they are prophet-slayers themselves. They suffer for the past, but also for their own deeds.

Most truly does Havet say of these and similar passages in the Gospels: 'The truth is that the Gospels, of which men commonly speak as if one found in them nothing but love and charity, are sometimes full of hatred....What has become of the precept of Deuteronomy: the fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers? Is it not here the old Law which might proudly turn the tables and say in its turn: You pretend that my children shall expiate the blood of the righteous; but I say unto you, Where are the suavities of the Sermon on the Mount? Where are the beatitudes? Where the order to bless those who curse you?' (*Le Christianisme et ses origines*, IV. pp. 244, 273).

35. Who is this Zechariah, the son of Barachias? He has been identified with the priest Zechariah mentioned in 2 Chron. xxiv. 20, who was killed in the court of the Temple by the order of King Joash about 850 B.C. But (*a*) this man was the son of Jehoiada; (*b*) he is only mentioned in Chronicles; (*c*) he was not killed between the sanctuary and the altar, but in the court of the Temple; and (*d*) he was by no means the last righteous man slain in Jewish history. Hence some commentators (including W.) think that the reference is to Zechariah, son of Bariscæus (an odd form, perhaps corrupted from Baruch, which would be the same as Barachias). This man was murdered by the zealots just before the war with Rome (67 or 68 A.D.): see Josephus, *Wars*, IV. 5, 4. His blood was shed within the sanctuary, and could be justly regarded as the last righteous blood shed before the destruction of the Jewish State. Thus a reference is put into the mouth of Jesus to an event which happened thirty years after his death. On the other hand, Nestle has pointed out that Zechariah of Chronicles became an important figure in Jewish legend, showing that he was a good deal talked about. Moreover, he is the *last* martyr mentioned in Chronicles, and therefore, as Chronicles is the last book, in the Bible. Hence he may be the man to whom Matthew alludes. So too Loisy. He agrees with Harnack and others as to the quotation from the apocalyptic Jewish book. Luke perhaps, in transcribing, thought that Jesus described himself as the Divine Wisdom, and Matthew may have put the

words into Jesus's mouth, because he identified Jesus with that Wisdom. Luke has the older words in, 'they will kill and persecute'; Matthew in, 'prophets, wise men and scribes.' 'The primitive document seems to have had reference, not to the announcement of the Gospel to the Jews, but to the scheme of Providence for Israel. The sending of the prophets, the wise men and the scribes seems to be an apocalyptic view of the revelation of the Old Testament, of which these three categories of persons are considered as the successive representatives; and this view corresponds entirely to the systematic conception according to which human and Jewish history is a tissue of crimes, of which the murder of Abel is the first and that of Zechariah the last. The two views are in a way circumscribed by the Bible itself, that is to say by the Hebrew canon of the Old Testament. They fit Christ less than some Jewish writer nurtured in the spirit of the apocalypses. It is conceivable that the Saviour can have represented the murder of Zechariah as the last crime of the Jews? An exegetical writer may have done so, and the more easily, because he perhaps ante-dated his book, putting it under the patronage of some name which was celebrated in ancient times.' On the other hand, 'son of Barachias' is a gloss. And though 'it may be unnatural and rabbinical to put forward the murder of the son of Jehoiada as the last crime of the Jews, it is not more natural and quite as rabbinical to lay the murder of Abel to their charge' (*E. S.* II. pp. 385, 386). J. Weiss thinks that *Matthew* may have thought of the later Zechariah, while the *source* (Q) meant the earlier one of Chronicles. J. Weiss even wants to claim the passage for Jesus. So too Merx. Luke has not got the false addition 'son of Barachias,' which is due, Merx thinks, to a confusion between the intended Zechariah of 2 Chron. xxiv. and the canonical prophet. *Cp.* Zech. i. 1 and Is. viii. 2 (Septuagint). Merx thinks that a quotation from a Jewish book called 'Wisdom,' quoted by Jesus, has been expanded and 'christianized' by Matthew or his editors.

37-39. LAMENT OVER JERUSALEM

(*Cp.* Luke xiii. 34, 35)

37 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killest the prophets, and stonest
them who are sent unto thee, how often have I desired to gather
thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her brood under
38 her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you
39 desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till
ye shall say, Blessed in the name of the Lord is he that cometh.'

37. The apostles tried to convert the Jews, but in vain. So W. Some try to keep the passage for Jesus, and would see in it an indication that he was more than once at Jerusalem.

38. 'Your house' is Jerusalem, and not here probably the Temple. The plain meaning of the words, as W. says, is 'Jerusalem shall be left desolate a long time.' The city is *already* in ruins. The usual interpretation is to make the words mean 'abandoned by God.' When one reads the desperate attempts of J. Weiss to keep the words for Jesus, one is the more inclined to approve the pungent remark of W.: 'Die neueren Exegeten machen die Augen zu und denken an dies und das.' Yet Harnack is not afraid to combat Wellhausen. For 37-39 stood in Q! To him 'your house' means the Temple. 'Is left desolate' (*ἀφίεται ἔρημος*) is used as a prophetic future, a reproduction of Jer. xxii. 5, 'This house will be a desolation' (*εἰς ἐρήμωσιν ἔσται*). Luke omitted *ἔρημος* to improve the Greek. For the reproduction of Jeremiah, as Matthew has it, did not sound quite logical, for the idea of destruction has to be supplied, and this is not good Greek. Thus, while Matthew said: 'Your Temple will be left, to your discomfiture, in a condition of desolation,' Luke corrected this to, 'Your Temple will be delivered up (abandoned).' The passive *ἀφίεσθαι* is used as in xxiv. 40 where it stands in contrast to *παραλαμβάνεσθαι*.

In spite of the fact that Luke has this section in another connection Harnack is of opinion that 37, 38 are still part of the quotation from the apocryphal book. Wisdom is the speaker. It is Wisdom who has sent prophets, wise men and scribes, and has thus sought to protect and save the city. Jesus could not have said, '*how often* have I wished to gather together,' &c., nor could he have lamented over the prophets, wise men and scribes whom the Jews had murdered. Harnack leaves it uncertain whether Jesus really made this quotation from the apocryphal book, or whether the passage is only put into his mouth. In either case 'I send' in 34 is really equivalent to 'I have sent.' Loisy also thinks that the quotation from the 'Wisdom' apocalypse extends over 37 and 38. 'The simile of the bird (it is by no means certain that it is a hen) which gathers her young ones under her wing, fits God, not Jesus. The children of Jerusalem are not so much the inhabitants of the town as all the Jews whose spiritual fatherland is Jerusalem. The attempts which had been made to unite them, to bring them back to the law of their calling, are not the visits of Christ, but the sending in succession of the prophets who had been massacred. For the apostrophe to Jerusalem has the closest connection with the preceding passage. In reality "the prophets, the wise men, the scribes" had been already sent; they had been killed and stoned; it is this series of murders, known by legend more than by Scripture, which was about to be punished; it constitutes the crime of Jerusalem, because it is the crime of the Jewish people. The unbelief of the chosen people was about to be its destruction, because God, angered by such long ingratitude, was about to leave his abode, the city of which he was king, and abandon it to his enemies' (*E. S.* II. p. 387). This seems plausible.

Merx thinks that the quotation from 'Wisdom' continues to the very end of the chapter. Wisdom is feminine, and can use the metaphor of the hen much better than Jesus, a man. ἔρημος is wanting in S.S., and the meaning of 38 is 'your house (the Temple) is abandoned, left, of me, Wisdom, and Jerusalem shall not see me again till the advent of Messiah.' So too Dr Carpenter. 'The entire passage (34–39) is a quotation from some lost visions in which the divine Wisdom was the speaker....Matthew rightly joins what Luke divides; or rather Luke wrongly separates what Matthew offers as continuous. Each throws light upon the other; Matthew shows us that the passages belong together: Luke supplies the important fact that they form a quotation from a vanished book; but it is difficult to believe that this peculiar arrangement could have come about directly through either writer's use of the other's work' (*First Three Gospels*, p. 297).

39. W. holds that Jesus here rather *assumes* than predicts his death; he mainly *predicts* his (second) coming. The Parousia is not coincident with the fall of Jerusalem. For Jerusalem had already fallen: Jesus had not come. Therefore the men of a later generation felt that he must have predicted that an interval would lie between the fall of the city and his second coming, during which time it would remain in ruins. Hence the present verse, probably written some years after his death. On the other hand, it has been argued that the verse implies that the Jews are to accept Jesus joyfully and willingly at the Parousia. Hence J. Weiss holds that the sentence must be 'very old'; he would apparently like to claim it for Jesus himself. It may be that the statement in 39 does not really belong to 37, 38, and has been hooked on to these verses by the 'source.' Weiss reads too much into it. Those who say 'Blessed,' &c., are not necessarily the whole Jewish people. And any way, when the Messiah comes in glory, all must, *ipso facto*, be convinced. The words in themselves imply that the Parousia is near, whereas in their present position they would rather imply that the Parousia is not very imminent: the punishment must come first. It is very difficult to assign any exact meaning to the words if they are to be regarded by themselves,

apart from their environment, and as authentic. We must then suppose that Jesus meant that his active ministry was over. He had spoken all he had to say. (Probably this verse would stand in the source at the end of his public preaching in Jerusalem). And he expects that the *dénouement* will soon take place. He will make no further appearances in public before he is revealed as Messiah. Or shall we even add: what is now to come Jesus does not precisely know? It may be, death. But of one thing he is sure. The Messiah in his glory, that is himself as Messiah in glory, will soon be revealed. I find this interpretation very doubtful, and prefer W.'s. Loisy makes a suggestion which is, at any rate, worth considering. If true, it might enable us to believe that 39 was not composed apart from its present environment. He thinks that in view of the indifference and opposition which Jesus encountered in Jerusalem, he came to the conclusion that the punishment of Israel must precede the coming of the Kingdom. 'Le Christ ne parlait pas de sa mort: prenant congé de ses auditeurs, il les ajournait, sans autre explication, à son prochain avènement dans la gloire' (*E. S.* II. p. 390).

Looking back over the whole chapter, it is wonderful that J. Weiss can speak of it as a 'historic document of the first rank' *on the ground that* it paints for us the 'Wesen' of the Pharisees 'in plastischer Weise mit unvergleichlich prägnantem und packendem Ausdruck,' and that it 'throws a strong light upon the personality of Jesus.' Here are a host of charges brought forward by bitter enemies of the Pharisees; even if some of the chapter (which is doubtful) goes back to Jesus, it has admittedly been largely edited by Christians, by men who thought that the Pharisees had killed 'their Saviour,' and who also had perhaps personally suffered at their hands. And yet such sweeping charges brought by bitter personal enemies are accepted without a word as simple, unadulterated truth! As to the assertion that the chapter throws a strong light upon the character of Jesus, no doubt he was capable of fierce invective and considerable exaggeration. But one may hope that the wilder charges need not be put to his account. I trust that Loisy is not accurate when he says that, in spite of the modifications it has received, it is the discourse against the Pharisees which, with the parable of the fig tree (Luke xiii. 6–9), represents most exactly the preaching of Jesus at Jerusalem (*E. S.* II. p. 389).

CHAPTER XXIV

1–44. The End and its Signs

(*Cp.* Mark xiii.; Luke xxi. 5–33, xvii. 23–37)

1 And Jesus left the temple, and went on his way, and his
disciples came to him to show him the buildings of the temple.
2 And he answered and said unto them, 'See ye not all these things?
verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon
another, which shall not be thrown down.'

3 And as he sat upon the mount of Olives, the disciples came
unto him privately, saying, 'Tell us, when will these things be?
and what will be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the
4 Age?' And Jesus answered and said unto them, 'Take heed
5 that no one lead you astray. For many will come in my name,
6 saying, I am the Messiah; and they will lead many astray. And
ye will hear of wars and rumours of wars: see that ye be not
alarmed: for these things must happen, but the End is not yet.
7 For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom:
8 and there will be famines and earthquakes in divers places. All
these are the beginning of the Pangs.

9 'Then will they deliver you up to affliction; and they will kill
you: and ye will be hated by all nations for my name's sake.
10 And then many will stumble, and betray one another, and hate
11 one another. And many false prophets will rise, and lead many
12 astray. And because lawlessness will increase, the love of many
13 will grow cold. But he that endureth unto the End, he shall be
14 saved. And this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all
the world for a witness unto all nations; and then will the End
come.

15 'When then ye see the Abomination of Desolation, spoken of
by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place, (let him that
16 readeth give heed:) then let them who be in Judæa flee to the
17 mountains: let him who is on the roof not go down to take any
18 thing out of his house: neither let him who is in the field return
19 to fetch his cloak. And woe unto them that are with child, and
20 to them that give suck in those days! But pray ye that your
21 flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath: for then will
be great affliction such as hath not been from the beginning of the
22 world until now, and will not be again. And if those days were
not shortened, no flesh would be saved: but for the elect's sake
those days will be shortened.

23 'Then if any man say unto you, Lo, here is the Messiah, or
24 there; believe him not. For there will arise false Messiahs, and
false prophets, and they will show great signs and wonders; so
that, if it were possible, even the elect would be led astray.
25 Behold, I have foretold you.

26 'If, then, they say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert, go not
forth: or, behold, he is in the inner chambers, believe it not.
27 For as the lightning cometh forth from the east, and flasheth unto
28 the west; so shall the coming of the Son of man be. For wherever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together.

29 'But immediately after the affliction of those days the sun will
be darkened, and the moon will not give her light, and the stars
will fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens will be shaken:
30 and then the sign of the Son of man will appear in heaven: and
then all the tribes of the earth will mourn, and they will see the
Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great
31 glory. And he will send out his angels with a great trumpet, and
they will gather together his elect from the four winds, from one
end of heaven to the other.

32 'Now learn a parable from the fig tree: When its branch
becometh soft, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is
33 near: so too ye, when ye see all these things, know that he is near,
even at the door.

34 'Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away
35 till all these things shall have taken place. Heaven and earth
36 shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. But of that

day and hour no one knoweth, not even the angels of heaven, and
not even the Son, but only the Father.

37 'But as the days of Noah so shall the coming of the Son of
38 man be. For as in the days that were before the flood they kept
on eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until
39 the day that Noah entered into the ark, and perceived nothing
until the flood came, and swept them all away; so also shall the
40 coming of the Son of man be. Then there will be two men in a
41 field; the one will be taken, and the other left. Two women will
be grinding at the mill; the one will be taken, and the other left.

42 'Watch therefore: for ye know not on what day your Lord
43 may come. But know this, that if the master of the house had
known at what hour the thief would come, he would have watched,
44 and would not have permitted his house to be broken into. Therefore
be ye also ready: for at an hour when ye do not expect it, the
Son of man will come.

The twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew corresponds in a great part of it with the thirteenth chapter of Mark. It contains, that is, Matthew's version of the apocalyptic discourse. But Matthew has enlarged the discourse here and there, and has appended to it parables taken from Q or from other sources, and certain additions of his own. These extend to the end of the twenty-fifth chapter.

1. The chapter opens with Mark xiii. 1. The wording is slightly varied. The disciples point out to Jesus the Temple buildings. This looks as if it was believed that they had visited the Temple before, but that Jesus had not, or at any rate as if he were far less familiar with it than they.

3. Instead of the four special intimates, Matthew makes Jesus address the discourse to the disciples generally.

'The sign of thy coming, and of the end of the Age.' The word 'Parousia' is not found in Mark or Luke. It is a translation of Jewish expressions, but as applied to Jesus it does not strictly fit. For of him a *recoming* should be spoken of, not a *coming*. But though Jesus was in one sense to come again, he would come again as the Messiah in power. *His* recoming was the *Messiah's* coming. As the Messiah *de facto* and in his full reality, he would come then for the first time—once and once only. That is the older view. Hence the word Parousia could legitimately be used. So Brandt, 'Auch die Jünger Jesu haben nachmals nicht geglaubt, Jesus sei schon in seiner vergangenen Erscheinung der

Messias gewesen, sondern: der gekreuzigte und gestorbene Meister werde als Messias wiederkommen. Die Wiederkunft Jesu ist die Ankunft des Messias' (*Die Evangelische Geschichte*, p. 478). Parousia literally means a 'presence.' 'This visible presence, this apparition in the power and glory of the eternal Kingdom, was conceived in relation to a temporary *absence*, that is to the interval during which the Messiah was with his heavenly Father waiting for the final manifestation' (*E. S.* II. p. 400).

The phrase συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος is only found in Matthew xiii. 39, 40, xxiv. 3; and Hebrews ix. 26.

4–8 = Mark xiii. 5–8.

9–14. *Cp.* Mark xiii. 9–13. Mark's addition to the discourse had been already used by Matthew in x. 17–19, 21, 22. Or perhaps it would be more correct to say, with Loisy, that Mark had quoted from the speech to the disciples in Q which Matthew uses in x. In either case Matthew has here to repeat himself. The material contained in Mark xiii. 9–13 is therefore summarized, but variants are added.

9. This verse corresponds with the opening of Mark xiii. 9, and with the end of xiii. 12 and with xiii. 13 *a*. Note that whereas Mark and Matthew x. 22 have 'hated by all,' Matthew has here 'hated by all nations.' This is later. The Evangelist, as Loisy and others suppose, was thinking of the persecutions of Nero. The original 'all' may only have referred to Jews.

10. Here we come to treason and apostasy among the Christians themselves. They hate and betray one another.

11. The false prophets are probably Christian heretics, *cp.* vii. 15–22. They cause Christian charity (ἀγάπη) to grow cold. The substantive ἀγάπη is found only here in Matthew. It is not found in Mark. In Luke it occurs once, xi. 42.

13. This verse takes up Mark xiii. 13 *b*; Matt. x. 22.

14. This verse repeats with emphasis Mark xiii. 10.

15–22. *Cp.* Mark xiii. 14–20.

15. 'The Abomination of Desolation' is specially noted to be a quotation from Daniel. It is peculiar, as J. Weiss points out, that this prediction is still retained, though, when Matthew compiled his Gospel, the Temple and Jerusalem were in ruins. But the site

was still sacred. And so the mysterious, unnamed, undefined horror is still to appear before the End, when the heavenly Jerusalem shall descend, with the Son of man, upon the site of the old Temple.

20. The slight changes from Mark xiii. 18 are significant. Who are addressed? According to W., the Christians; they will flee from Jerusalem at its siege, and they are to pray that their flight may not have to be in winter, when it would be more painful, or on the Sabbath, when it would be against the Law. Or, perhaps, as on the Sabbath one might not go far, one would run more risk of falling into the enemy's hands. So Loisy. Even if the addition 'on the Sabbath' was found in Matthew's copy of Mark, its retention by Matthew shows his Judæo-Christian point of view. The Christians should still observe the Sabbath, just as they still pay the Temple tax (xvii. 27).

23-25 = Mark xiii. 21-23.

26-28. Not in Mark; Luke xvii. 23-25, 37. There may be a reference to the idea of the hidden Messiah, kept concealed till the hour of his revelation and coming.

27. No need to search for the Messiah. His coming will be manifest to all. His chosen ones will be at once united to him. This verse is supposed by Loisy to belong to a source which gives 'evangelic teaching,' and not to the apocalyptic discourse. There is here no question of signs or warnings. The coming of the Messiah is sure and swift.

28. A strange comparison. The presence of the eagles (vultures would be more in place) surely betokens the presence of carcases. Who are the eagles? W. asks: may they be the false prophets, the crop of whom, though they lie, betokens the near advent of the true Christ? Dr Carpenter thinks that it is a proverbial saying, without definite application, a symbol of cause and effect, joined on here quite loosely, with no specific reference to preceding materials, because it had to be put *somewhere*. Or perhaps: as certainly as the birds of prey flock to the carcase, so surely will the Faithful be united to their Lord. So Loisy. It is a mere comparison. The eagles no more represent the elect than the corpse represents Jesus. Mr Allen thinks the saying means that the Parousia will come when evil has reached its fated climax. 'Just as when life has abandoned a body, and it becomes a corpse, the vultures immediately swoop down upon it; so when the world has become rotten with evil, the Son of Man and his angels will come to execute the divine judgment.'

29–31. *Cp.* Mark xiii. 24–27; Luke xxi. 25–28.

29. Notice the 'immediately,' which is only found in Matthew. It is clear, as Pfleiderer points out, that the author of Matthew cannot have added this word, for it had been contradicted by history when he wrote. The destruction of the Jewish State had not been followed by the Judgment, the Parousia, the End. The author merely copied the words he found in his old apocalyptic source (of, say, about 60 A.D.). But it would be quite wrong to infer from this the early date of the Gospel of Matthew. 'Rather does our Evangelist here betray his genuine Church respect for the ancient oracular sayings whose contradiction with history was not noticed, and the exact wording of which was retained in the memory in the belief that the enigmatic meaning of their secret would some day be revealed and in some way be fulfilled' (*Urchristentum*, Vol. I. p. 594).

There is, however, another and perhaps more probable explanation of the 'immediately.' It is that of J. Weiss. The 'affliction of those days' which culminates in the establishment of the 'Abomination of Desolation' is not the destruction of Jerusalem, but something much worse, which is still to come. And 'immediately' after it does come—but this is still in the future—the Son of man will make his appearance.

30. 'The sign of the Son of man,' *i.e.* the sign of the End is the appearance of the Messiah. The sign consists in the Son of man's appearance. Another explanation is that it is a sign which the Son of man shall display—some mysterious token which was familiar to apocalyptic conceptions of the time (J. Weiss). It is remarkable that S.S. has 'ye shall see.' Was 'ye' changed to 'they' to allow for the death of the disciples who had not so seen? So Merx, who also notices that the unnecessary words, 'and all the tribes of the earth shall mourn,' are wanting in S.S. He regards them as an interpolation from Rev. i. 8. Loisy, on the supposition that the words are genuine, suggests a common source to the Evangelist and the author of Revelation.

32, 33. *Cp.* Mark xiii. 28, 29; Luke xxi. 29–31.

34–36. *Cp.* Mark xiii. 30–32; Luke xxi. 32, 33.

34. Matthew keeps: 'this generation shall not pass away,' &c., from Mark. 'Either some of the old generation were still alive when Matthew wrote, or he reckons the generations differently; perhaps he means his own generation, so that the terminus *ad quem* is postponed' (J. Weiss).

36. 'Not even the Son' is wanting in the S.S. Merx thinks this is the oldest text. But it may be a correction.

37–41. Not in Mark. *Cp.* Luke xvii. 26, 27, 34, 35. As Holtzmann points out, we have here material from a different source. The suddenness and unexpectedness of the Parousia are not in keeping with the signs of it which have been mentioned before. Loisy regards the substance of this section as quite authentic, and in keeping with the teaching of Jesus as to the suddenness of the Parousia. 'La mise en scène du jugement divin et du recrutement des élus est tout autre que celle du discours apocalyptique' (*E. S.* II. p. 441).

40. 'Taken and left': *i.e.* either taken, accepted [by the angels] for life; left, abandoned to destruction. Or: taken, seized by destruction; left, spared, left unharmed.

42–44. *Cp.* Mark xiii. 33–37; Luke xii. 37–40. From the suddenness and unexpectedness of the Messiah's coming is drawn the lesson of watchfulness. Be prepared! The metaphor of the thief is finely daring. Mixed up with it is the conception of the absent master, the hour of whose return to his own house is uncertain. We have now come out of the apocalypse, and Matthew is drawing on material which was probably used by Mark also and was certainly used by Luke. The general and original idea is always the same. The Kingdom of God will come soon. Be prepared for its coming.

45–51. THE FAITHFUL AND THE FAITHLESS SERVANT

(*Cp.* Luke xii. 41–46)

45 'Who, then, is the faithful and prudent servant, whom his lord
hath set over his household, to give them their food in due season?
46 Happy is that servant, whom his lord, when he cometh, shall find
47 so doing. Verily I say unto you that he will set him over all his
48 possessions. But if the evil servant say in his heart, My lord
49 tarrieth long, and if he begin to beat his fellow-servants, and to
50 eat and drink with drunkards, the lord of that servant will come
on a day when he looketh not for him, and at an hour which he
51 doth not know. And he will cut him asunder, and appoint his
portion with the hypocrites: there shall the weeping be and the
gnashing of teeth.'

Some (*e.g.* Loisy) think the parable in a more original form may be authentic. The source is Q. It merely would mean: Use your time well before the advent of the Kingdom and the Judgment. In its present form, it can hardly be doubted that the reference is to teachers and officers (bishops?) within the Christian community. One looks after his flock; the other neglects and maltreats them and seeks his own advantage. As W. says, some of the heads of the Christian congregations must have soon begun to abuse their offices. Here they are threatened with terrible, though only divine, punishment. Originally (in Q) the reference may have been intended to be wider and more general. All Christians must do their various duties properly in the community. The Messiah, when he comes, should find each believer fulfilling faithfully his trust. The last part of 51 falls outside the parable. The place where the hypocrites (or unbelievers) are, and where there is gnashing of teeth, is hell. There must have been a number of parables, some of which go back to Jesus, and some of which are later, dealing with the coming of the Kingdom and how the interval of time should be spent. Loisy supposes that the parable of the virgins and the short parable of the servants (Luke xii. 35, 36) were known to both Matthew and Luke, and that Luke chose the one and Matthew the other. He thinks that all these parables, including the master and the thief (Matt. xxiv. 43), the faithful and the faithless servant (Matt. xxiv. 45–51), formed a distinct group, which was united with the discourse on the Parousia now found in Luke xvii. The apocalyptic oration was joined on to these. Upon this material the three Evangelists drew, shortening, combining, expanding, transposing, as they thought fit. His view as to Mark is in opposition to that of W., who will not allow that Mark knew or used Q. 'Mark draws from the parables the conclusion which he gives to the apocalyptic discourse, as if he had found the parables after the discourse. Nevertheless, it is true that they did not form a part of it, for all presume, in conformity with the discourse on the Parousia, that the latter will happen soon, without any precursory signs, and it seems clear that the apocalyptic discourse concluded with the declaration, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." In their original application the parables are not concerned with the Parousia as the *return* of Jesus, but as the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven, the coming of the Christ and the Judgment of God' (*E. S.* II. pp. 447, 448).

CHAPTER XXV

1–13. THE WISE AND FOOLISH VIRGINS

(Matthew only)

1 'Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins,
2 who took their lamps, and went out to meet the bridegroom. And
3 five of them were foolish, and five were wise. For the foolish took
4 their lamps, but took no oil with them: but the wise took oil in
5 vessels with their lamps. Now as the bridegroom tarried, they all
6 grew drowsy and went to sleep. And at midnight a cry arose,
7 Behold, the bridegroom! Go out to meet him. Then all those
8 virgins got up, and trimmed their lamps. And the foolish said
unto the wise, Give us some of your oil; for our lamps are gone
9 out. But the wise answered, saying, There may not be enough
for us and for you: go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for
10 yourselves. And while they went to buy, the bridegroom arrived:
and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage-feast:
11 and the door was shut. Afterwards the other virgins came up
12 also, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. But he answered and said,
Verily I say unto you, I know you not.

13 'Watch therefore, for ye know not the day or the hour.

The parable is not one of the best in the Gospels. It is, as W. says, made up to suit the moral, and is full of inconsistencies and awkwardnesses. The moral is merely a repetition of the previous section: 'Be prepared for the coming of the Christ'; in other words, I suppose. 'Live a good life, so that if Messiah come suddenly, you may be accounted worthy to inherit eternal life, to enter into the Kingdom.' No repentance or 'return' is possible after the coming of Messiah, just as no repentance is possible, according both to the old Jewish and old Christian doctrine, after death.

The bridegroom is Christ; the virgins are half bridesmaids, half bride. For bridesmaids have not usually anything to do with the bridegroom after midnight, just as shops are not usually open at that hour. The whole parable is somewhat muddled. The marriage takes place in the house of the bride; the bridesmaids go out to meet the bridegroom at some appointed place with lighted lamps. As he delays to come, all go to sleep, a feature which has nothing to do with the moral. The distinction between the wise and the foolish is that the former bring a supply of spare oil, while the latter do not. The former are 'prepared'; the latter are careless.

12. Here Jesus is the judge rather than the bridegroom. The severity of the sentence is like xxiv. 51.

13. The moral. 'Watch' must be taken in rather a general sense. It means: 'be prepared,' not 'keep awake.' 'Live rightly'; not 'do not go to sleep.' All the virgins go to sleep, the wise as well as the foolish.

Some commentators, among them Loisy, want to claim the parable of the virgins, in its original form, for Jesus. As in the case of other parables of the same tendency in Matthew and Luke, they do not seem to me successful. Jesus, it is admitted, thought that the Kingdom was very near. It was always on the point of appearing. And in Jerusalem, according to Loisy's own interpretation, he expected it to the very last. What room or occasion then was there to urge that the interval between Now and Then should be well spent? Immediate repentance was the only possible counsel under the circumstances. As he began, so he could end: 'Repent, for the Kingdom is at hand.' But was there any need or room to say to disciples or outsiders, 'Lead a good and useful life between now and the Parousia'? It is argued that in the story as told by Jesus, the delay of the bridegroom had no special application or meaning, the bridegroom was not Jesus, and the virgins were not the Church. The parable 'fait ressortir uniquement le danger d'une préparation insuffisante, l'inconvénient d'arriver trop tard pour le royaume: quand le moment fatal viendra, il ne sera plus temps de se pourvoir.' But where is there room or need for such warning in the peculiar teaching of Jesus? 'Le retard de l'époux correspond seulement à ce fait, que le royaume ne se manifeste pas encore dans le moment où Jésus parle, bien qu'on l'annonce et le conçoive imminent' (*E. S.* II. p. 460). One cannot but doubt whether such a parable would have been constructed for such an end. If the parable, on the other hand, grew up to explain the delay in the coming of the Kingdom and to point out how the intervening time—of uncertain duration—should be spent, all is clear and cogent.

Luke's parallels are xiii. 25 and xii. 35, 36, and his short, crisp sentences are in W.'s opinion more original than Matthew's parable. Loisy thinks the reverse. *Cp.* also Mark xiii. 35-37, which Loisy, far from holding to be the original (like W., though even this original is, for W., an addition to the *Urmarkus*, and of later date than 70 and the fall of Jerusalem), regards as a mere extract and *résumé* from older and larger sources. 'Marc a voulu résumer, dans cette conclusion générale du discours apocalyptique, un enseignement qu'il trouvait plus développé dans la source ou dans les sources qu'il exploite. Sa peroraison est faite avec les fragments de paraboles et d'exhortations qui se sont conservées au complet dans les deux autres Synoptiques' (*E. S.* II. p. 447).

14-30. THE PARABLE OF THE TALENTS

(*Cp.* Luke xix. 11-27)

14 'For it is like a man going abroad, who called his servants, and
15 delivered unto them his property. And unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; to every man accord-
16 ing to his capacity. Then he departed. Then he that had received the five talents straightway went and traded with them, and made
17 five talents more. And likewise he that had received two, he also
18 gained two more. But he that had received one went and dug in the earth, and hid his lord's money.

19 'After a long time the lord of those servants came back, and
20 settled accounts with them. Then he that had received the five talents came and brought the other five talents, saying, Lord, thou didst deliver unto me five talents: behold, I have gained beside
21 them five talents more. His lord said unto him, Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful in respect of little, I will set thee over much: enter thou into the joy of thy
22 lord. He that had received two talents came also and said, Lord, thou didst deliver unto me two talents: behold, I have gained two
23 other talents beside them. His lord said unto him, Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful in respect of little, I will set thee over much: enter thou into the joy of thy
24 lord. Then he who had received the one talent came and said, Lord, I knew that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast

25 not sown, and gathering where thou hast not winnowed. And I
was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth; lo, here thou
26 hast what is thine. His lord answered and said unto him, Thou
wicked and slothful servant; didst thou know that I reap where I
27 have not sown, and gather where I have not winnowed? Then
oughtest thou to have put my money with the bankers, and then
at my return I should have received mine own with interest.
28 Take therefore the talent from him, and give it unto him who hath
29 the ten talents. For unto everyone that hath shall be given, and
he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be
30 taken away even that which he hath. And cast ye the useless
servant into the outer darkness: there shall the weeping be and
the gnashing of teeth.

It is disputed whether in this parable, perhaps taken from Q, the allusions to the Second Advent were added later or not. Many commentators would like to preserve the parable for Jesus—to regard it as spoken by him—and to suppose that originally it had nothing to do with the Parousia. So, for instance, Loisy. The parable originally, he holds, had nothing to do either with the Parousia or with the last Judgment. 'Elle était destinée à montrer que la récompense des justes, dans le royaume des cieux, sera proportionnée ou plutôt accordée à leurs mérites, et que ceux dont les mérites seront nuls n'auront point de part au bonheur éternel' (*E. S.* II. p. 464). M. Loisy, being a Roman Catholic, does not mind using the word 'merit.' It does not cause him qualms, as it does to a Lutheran like J. Weiss. The simple lesson of the parable can be simply recorded by him. But even as edited by the Evangelist, the parable preaches the duty of fidelity and of active work for the community. The gifts and favours which God has given are to be used in his service; they are, as it were, to be given back to him with increase. They who so act will also themselves reap their reward. For what helps the community makes him also who helps a better and a richer man. If verse 29 belongs to, and is an essential part of, the whole, the parable means no less than this. If not, we must limit it to the moral that man's powers and gifts are to be used and increased; they are not to be neglected and allowed to rust. Inaction spells loss. He who does not go forward goes back. In its present connection the parable is not unlike its predecessor. The Advent or Judgment will come, though it is delayed; but because it is sure to come, Christians are not to while away the intervening period. They must use it for the service of the community. 'The use of the word, talent, to mean intellectual endowment is based upon this parable; when we speak of a talent therefore, we regard the gift as a property entrusted to us which is, above everything, to be employed and made useful in the service of God' (J. Weiss).

14. It would seem not unlikely that originally the man gave his servants, not *talents*, but minæ, as in Luke. A Jewish mina was then worth about 72*s.*; the old Jewish mina about 112*s.* The man entrusts his whole fortune to his servants, but it is not necessarily implied that they were only three, or that his whole fortune was eight talents, though that is a considerable sum (£1750). The money is given, not as a deposit, but as capital to trade with. He divides it in accordance with the business capacity of each.

19. He is away a long time. This means to Matthew that the Parousia has been long delayed, and is still not to be expected immediately. But it need not have had such a meaning in the original parable. Note the word, ἔρχεται, 'comes.' 'Matthieu ne dit pas *revint*, et il emploie le présent, parce que lui aussi pense à la parousie' (*E. S.* II. p. 470).

21. In spite of 28, it would seem that we are not to suppose that any of the *money* is *given* to the servant. The reward is rather indicated by the word καταστήσω: *i.e.* a reward of office or position. ἐπὶ ὀλίγα, 'faithful in respect of little.' Hardly little, if the master lent him five talents. An argument for the originality of minæ. Assuming that the parable is old and authentic, the little and much belong to the same category. The editor, the Evangelist, thinks, however, of something very different: he has in his mind the disproportion of human merits and well-doing as compared with the glory of the Kingdom. To him the real reward is the reward of the Kingdom: the joy of the Messianic era.

23. It must be noticed that he who has done well with his two talents apparently receives the same reward as he who has done well with the five. It is not a question of much and little, but, as the Rabbis would say, of intention and desire. If a man does honestly his best, that is all which God asks.

24. Has the excuse of the third servant any special meaning? Apparently not. It does not seem workable to make it signify any current but mistaken conception of Jesus or of God. (Though truly, according to the mournful and terrible doctrine that many go to 'destruction' and few to 'life,' God is a hard taskmaster indeed!) Nor does the reaping where he did not sow, and the gathering where he did not scatter, seem capable of application. It is part

of the dramatic environment of the parable, which must not be pressed in its moral.

'As in other parables—*e.g.* the unjust steward—the characters of the parable are not painted as ideal. It would heighten the point of the parable if the master *were* egoistic and keen on money. For then the fidelity of the good servants in making money for him is all the greater; all the worse the laziness of the bad servant' (J. Weiss).

26. Even if the servant had this conception of his master's character, he ought to have acted differently. For his laziness there is no excuse. It is a mere pretext if he says he was afraid. Or rather, he ought not to have been afraid. 'Mit Trägheit ist Vertrauenslosigkeit nur zu oft verbunden' (J. Weiss). Even if his master was hard and avaricious, he would have done better for that very reason to have taken the trouble to increase the money allotted to him. The contrast between the way in which the first two servants used the money, and the way in which it is suggested that the third servant might have used it, must not be pressed. No application is to be made of the bank.

As W. says, one must not ask what the master would have said if the first two servants, instead of accomplishing a successful 'deal' with the money, had lost the whole of it.

27. 'Wahre Treue macht den Knecht freudig und frei, da er sich mit seinem Herrn identifizirt' (W.). The true explanation and defence of the Rabbinic religion, so far as it is a 'service,' are contained in these words. But could W. himself perceive it?

28. The one talent might have been equally well given to the man who received the two talents. Is it given as reward, or as new capital? This is not clear. J. Weiss thinks the whole verse has been added to prepare for, or lead on to, 29.

29. W. thinks that this verse is awkwardly interpolated from Mark iv. 25. The punishment of the lazy servant is (by the interpolation) brought under a general rule. W. remarks that the meaning of the adage, which stands isolated in Mark, is not thereby made clearer. Loisy on the contrary thinks the proverb comes in naturally, and that the parable is the source whence Mark borrowed it! 'On donne à qui possède, et l'on prend à qui n'a rien; le riche s'en va toujours gagnant, et le pauvre toujours perdant' (*E. S.* II. pp. 475 and 481). J. Weiss has a peculiar explanation. God's salvation is not a reward: it is the natural, though divine, completion or perfection of what is already 'within' or 'there.' From him who has not the right disposition shall be taken that

false possession of which he boasts. It shall be 'taken' at the Judgment. J. Weiss would like to remove from the saying, as from other sayings, all trace of the 'Jewish' doctrine of reward. He is not only, I think, in error as regards the interpretation of the saying, but makes the author of it guilty of something far more objectionable and irreligious than the doctrine of reward, namely, of the Johannine dualism, as if in some men there was from the beginning a predestined divine receptivity, which will bring them to heaven, and as if in others the lack of this receptivity would bring them for certain to hell and keep them there for all eternity. Better strict retribution than this! Better the 'Jewish' doctrine of reward and punishment than the horrible dualism of the author of the Gospel of Love!

30. If the parable is old and authentic, this verse is added. For, as M. Loisy says, it is Jesus, as judge and Messianic ruler, who pronounces sentence of condemnation upon the useless servant and orders him to be thrown into hell. There is a good deal in Loisy's argument that the verse is a surplusage. There is no need for an extra punishment, and the environment and scene of the parable are quite forgotten. Nor does the verse suit the application of the parable, which is rather that as the negligent servant has the money taken away from him, so the man who does not use God's gifts to profit will see them taken away from him and given to others.

The original parable, according to this argument, closed with 29. It was not difficult to use it for the purpose which Matthew required. For the judgment of God is alluded to in both cases. In the original parable the teaching is that God deals severely with those who neglect their duties and opportunities. The Kingdom of God is to be entered only by those who by their earthly life have deserved it. 'La récompense vient au mérite, et le défaut de mérite entraîne la misère infinie: le jugement de Dieu confère aux seuls bienheureux l'héritage proposé d'abord à tous, et semble enrichir ceux qui le possèdent à tout jamais, par l'exclusion définitive de ceux, qui ont perdu le droit d'y prétendre' (*E. S.* II. p. 479).

It was easy to modify the meaning without disturbing the story. The master is of course Jesus the Messiah, the servants symbolize different kinds of Christians within the Church. In the talents Matthew, according to Loisy, is specially thinking of 'faith and the other spiritual graces.' (This does not seem to me certain.)

W., on the other hand, holds that the parable was written for its present place and in its present form. The parable starts, and is made up, from Mark xiii. 33-37 and especially and mainly from verse 34. There, too, the Parousia is in the background. Because the moral of the parable can exist without the Parousia, one must not therefore eliminate the Parousia, which was the most potent motive for all morality among the oldest Christians, even though Jesus cannot have used it. Nor is it justifiable, especially in Matthew, to attempt to clear the parables of all allegorising. All Matthew's parables are related to, and bear in mind, the 'Kingdom': *i.e.* the oldest Christian community and its situation, so that the parables can be used for the beginnings of Church history.

31–46. THE DAY OF JUDGMENT

(Matthew only)

31 'When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the
holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his
32 glory: and before him will be gathered all nations: and he will
separate them one from another, as a shepherd separateth the sheep
33 from the goats: and he will set the sheep on his right hand, but the
34 goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right
hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared
35 for you from the foundation of the world: for I was hungry, and ye
gave me to eat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a
36 stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick,
37 and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came to me. Then the
righteous will answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee hungry,
38 and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we
39 thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? Or
40 when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came to thee? And
the King will answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you,
whatever ye have done unto one of these my humblest brethren,
41 ye have done unto me. Then shall he say also unto them on the
left hand, Depart from me, ye accursed, into everlasting fire, pre-
42 pared for the devil and his angels: for I was hungry, and ye gave
43 me not to eat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a
stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not:
44 sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then will they also
answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee hungry, or thirsty, or
a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister

45 unto thee? Then will he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, whatever ye did not to one of these humblest, ye did not to
46 me. And these shall depart to everlasting punishment: but the righteous to everlasting life.'

This section according to B. Weiss, like the preceding parables, is also taken from Q, except 31 and 32 *a*, which are due to Matthew. He calls it 'eine Ermahnung zur Barmherzigkeit in der Form einer Gerichtsschilderung, nach welcher hiernach das Schicksal der Jünger entschieden wird. Mt. hat sie als eine Schilderung des Endgerichts aufgefasst, die über alle Völker gehalten wird' (*Quellen*, B, p. 73). This view is extremely improbable. That those on the right and left hand of the Son of man address him as 'Lord,' only shows, as Holtzmann says, that an 'Ansiedelung des Christentums' in all the world is already assumed. Holtzmann thinks the section is due to the same hand as that which composed xiii. 36–43, and this may well be the case. That hand may very well be, as Loisy thinks, that of the Evangelist himself, writing what he justly regarded as a fitting close to the parables and discourses which he had put together in xxiv. and xxv. 1–30. It develops from the point of view of the last Judgment the saying of Jesus: 'Whoso receives you, receives me' (Matt. x. 40, xviii. 5; Mark ix. 37). Though based upon this saying, the development is highly striking and original. It contains one of the noblest passages in the entire Gospel. It only shows how inspired an editor could sometimes be, and how dangerous it is to use the argument: 'Such and such a thought is so fine, it must have been said by Jesus.' How many deeds of charity and love, how many acts of sacrifice and devotion, must have been accomplished in the last eighteen hundred years by the remembrance of the words: 'Inasmuch as ye did it to the least of these my brothers, ye did it unto me.' And another reflection is strongly brought before us by this section. How close lie good and evil within the thought of one and the same man! For the same editorial hand which penned the glorious verse 40, penned the horrible words that follow. The eternal fire is as firmly believed in as the beauty of charity. So careful must we be to realize that the intolerance of Rabbinic Jew or early Christian towards those without the pale of race or creed may yet consort with a life of devoted sacrifice and lowly duty towards those who are within. In the present case, it is, however, some satisfaction that the criterion for heaven and hell is purely moral. Creed does not enter in. Yet even here our satisfaction is mixed and sad. We cannot help wondering that the same man whose religion was high enough to rise to the level of verse 40 could also have believed, without the smallest compunction or regret, that the good God would send any of his creatures to everlasting fire. We could almost wish that so horrible a belief, so lightly and comfortably accepted, should be limited to those who believed that the test of God's judgment was a matter of genealogy or a matter of dogmatic creed.

31. The appearance of the Son of man (here identified with Jesus Christ) for judgment is now described.

32. Though the passage begins with the familiar *mise-en-scène* of the Judgment—all nations collected before the Judge's throne—the Judgment is restricted to the people in whom the writer is specially interested—*i.e.* the Christian community. The nations are forgotten. They form the mere scenic background. Both the good and the bad, both sheep and goats, are Christians. Or did the writer suppose that all the nations were converted before the Judgment? *Cp.* Holtzmann's view, above. (*Cp.* xxviii. 19; Loisy, *E. S.* II. p. 484.)

33. The sheep are the good, gentle, and kindly people; the goats are the proud, sinful, and violent people (*cp.* Ezek. xxxiv. 17, &c.).

Both heaven and hell, the Kingdom and the fire, have been 'prepared' from 'everlasting.' Now they are to receive their pedestined inhabitants. The fire receives not only the bad men, but the devil and his 'angels.'

It is indeed fair to note, with Loisy, that the fire was not originally prepared for men, but for the devil and his auxiliaries. It has become the lot of the *men* through their own fault. It is not quite certain whether the word 'prepared' in 34 and 41 means predestined, or that the Kingdom and the fire were already in existence. Loisy says: 'On peut dire que la pensée de Matthieu flotte entre la prédestination et la préexistence; il serait risqué d'affirmer qu'elle vise la première à l'exclusion de la seconde. Est-il vraisemblable que le feu destiné à Satan n'existe pas encore? Les apocalypses le connaissent comme déjà existant' (*E. S.* II. p. 485, n. 2).

34. 'The change from Son of man (31) to King is very abrupt and unexpected. It looks as though a parable in which the King was the central figure had been adapted to refer to the coming of the Son of man' (Allen). It must be confessed that there seems something in this argument. The Messiah or Son of man is not elsewhere called King, though his Kingdom is spoken about.

36. The thought is based on such passages as x. 42, Mark ix. 41, &c. To stimulate the practice of fraternal charity among Christians Matthew makes the last Judgment turn upon it solely,

as if the goats were accursed for mere sins of omission (Loisy). The charity rendered, the loving service paid, to the lowliest Christian, is regarded by Christ as if rendered to himself. 'As the Gospel is summed up in the precept of charity, it is upon this law that the Judgment will be conducted' (*E. S.* II. p. 487). There need not even be the conscious thought that it is done for Christ or in his name. This is splendid doctrine, and goes beyond (just because it implies that even 'in my name' is not required) the teaching of xviii. 5 and Mark ix. 37 (J. Weiss). The loving deed is enough. No purer account, no more exquisite delineation, of Christian philanthropy was ever penned. It is most admirable—broad, liberal, and truly religious.

It would be amusing, if it were not sad, that J. Weiss calls the disagreeable part of the picture of the Judgment very 'Jewish'—as if Christianity had not made the most abundant use of hell and its flames!—while: 'um so unjüdischer berührt uns die herrliche Idee 35–40.' Whereas in truth 35–40 is no less, and probably more, Jewish than all the rest. The instances are characteristically Jewish instances of 'Gemiluth Chesadim,' the doing of lovingkindnesses (*cp.* also Isaiah lviii. 7). Note the visiting of prisoners. It points to the era of persecutions.

40. A more sublime reply can hardly be conceived. The worth which Christianity assigned to every human soul brought a new feature into the Roman and heathen world. Even the poorest and most wretched creature—a gladiator, a prostitute, a slave—had separate, distinct value in the eyes of God. The doctrine had doubtless immense effects upon civilization and morality in various directions. Nor must we overlook the personal motive introduced. In the parable the deeds of mercy are done without any conscious thought of the King. But in Christian life it has just been this conscious thought—for *his* sake—which has prompted and sustained the deeds. Judaism also has taught and still teaches the worth of every human soul. But the particular motive—for *his* sake—is necessarily wanting to its adherents. They have to say for God's sake instead of for Jesus's sake, and doubtless the peculiar combination in Jesus, as simple Christian believers hold—of the man and the God—has given an immense power to this special motive, 'for his sake.' It would be foolish not to recognize the force and grandeur of ethical motive in a religion, because, as the religion is not one's own, one cannot share, or be stimulated by, that motive.

41. The terrible doctrine of eternal punishment, 'perhaps the most frightful idea that has ever corroded human character' (Morley, *Miscellanies*, II. p. 237), is here emphatically asserted, and solemnly put into the mouth of Jesus. So too in 46. How can anyone now-a-days call it, as Mr Allen does, a 'splendid ending'?

CHAPTER XXVI

1–5. THE DECISION OF THE PRIESTS AND SCRIBES

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 1, 2; Luke xxii. 1, 2)

1 And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished all these words,
2 he said unto his disciples, 'Ye know that after two days is the
passover, and the Son of man is to be delivered up to be crucified.'
3 Then the chief priests, and the Elders of the people, assembled
together at the palace of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas,
4 and they determined to seize Jesus by craft, and to kill him.
5 But they said, 'Not during the festival, lest there be an uproar
among the people.'

For the story of the Passion and of the resurrection Matthew seems to have relied for his written source upon Mark. We do not know that he possessed any other. Q, as all agree, did not contain the story of the Passion. As Loisy observes: 'Marc paraît la source unique, et les variantes de Matthieu dans les récits paralléles n'ont pas grande importance: mais certaines additions sont dues à l'Évangéliste, soit qu'elles résultent de ses méditations personnelles, soit qu'elles aient été empruntées à la tradition orale' (*E. S.* I. p. 134). But in more than one passage in the Commentary Loisy is compelled to allow that Matthew may have known and used the source on which Mark himself, or at any rate our present Mark, depends.

2. The date given by the narrator in Mark xiv. 1 is here put into the mouth of Jesus.

3. Matthew turns the informal determination of the authorities, as given in Mark xiv. 1, into a formal sitting and decision of the Sanhedrin. It meets, not in the regular place of assembly,

but (for greater secrecy) in the court of the high priest's palace. The day of the meeting to Matthew would probably be Tuesday. Matthew names the high priest Caiaphas. That is correct (*cp.* Luke iii. 2). Does Matthew suppose that this session of the Sanhedrin continues till verse 57? He has 'Elders of the people,' instead of Mark's 'scribes.'

6–13. THE ANOINTING IN BETHANY

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 3–9; Luke vii. 36–50)

6 Now when Jesus was in Bethany, in the house of Simon the
7 leper, there came unto him a woman having an alabaster cruse of
very precious ointment, and poured it on his head as he sat at
8 table. But when his disciples saw it, they were indignant, saying,
9 'Wherefore this waste? For this ointment might have been sold
10 for a large sum, and given to the poor.' But when Jesus perceived
it, he said unto them, 'Why vex ye the woman? for she has
11 wrought a good deed towards me. For ye have the poor always
12 with you; but me ye have not always. For when she poured this
13 ointment on my body, she did it for my burial. Verily I say unto
you, Wherever this Gospel shall be preached in the whole world,
that which she has done shall also be spoken of in her memory.'

8. Here the indefinite 'some' of Mark is changed into 'his disciples.'

10. γνούς. Jesus does not hear what they say, but reads their thoughts.

14–16. JUDAS'S TREACHERY

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 10, 11; Luke xxii. 3–6)

14 Then one of the Twelve, called Judas Iscariot, went unto the
15 chief priests, and said unto them, 'What are ye willing to give me,
if I betray him unto you?' And they weighed out to him thirty
16 pieces of silver. And from that time he sought a good opportunity
to betray him.

15. The treachery of Judas received further details as time went on. Matthew makes his motive greed. As in verse 5 the statement in Mark is turned into a remark by the actor.

The sum 'thirty pieces of silver' is due to Zech. xi. 12; *cp.* notes on xxvii. 3–9. Here we have one of the clearest examples of history made up from bits of Old Testament prophecy.

They 'weighed' out to him the money, although, as Holtzmann says, money was then no longer weighed. The sum is very small. The further improbability that they gave the money for his offer, and not for performance, can hardly be overcome, seeing that 'weighed' is taken from the verse in Zechariah, by translating *ἔστησαν*, 'they promised.'

17–19. PREPARATION FOR THE PASSOVER

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 12–16; Luke xxii. 7–13)

17 And on the first day of the unleavened bread the disciples
came to Jesus, saying unto him, 'Where wouldst thou that we
18 prepare for thee to eat the passover?' And he said, 'Go into the
city to such a man, and say unto him, The Master says, My time
is nigh; I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples.'
19 And the disciples did as Jesus had bidden them; and they prepared
the passover

17. Mark's narrative is shortened. Is this, as W. supposes, done to avoid its magical element?—('um das Wahrsagerhafte abzustreichen'). Some critics suppose that we have here a more ancient and historical account, depending upon another and older narrative than Mark. This does not seem necessary, in view of the fact that Matthew has often before, from one motive or another, shortened Mark's narrative.

18. 'My time is nigh'—Matthew only. The owner of the house must have been a disciple to understand this allusion.

20–25. JESUS PREDICTS THE BETRAYAL

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 17–21; Luke xxii. 20–23)

20 So when the evening had come, he sat at table with the Twelve.
21 And as they ate he said, 'Verily I say unto you, that one of you
22 will betray me.' And they were deeply grieved, and began one
23 after the other to say unto him, 'Lord, surely not I?' And he
answered and said, 'He that dipped his hand with me in the dish,
24 he will betray me. The Son of man departeth as it is written of

him: but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed!
25 Better were it for that man if he had not been born.' Then Judas,
who betrayed him, answered and said, 'Master, surely not I?' He
said unto him, 'Thou hast said.'

23. For Mark's present participle ἐμβαπτόμενος, Matthew has the aorist participle ἐμβάψας, 'he who has just dipped his hand into the dish.' Matthew apparently wishes us to assume that Judas had just dipped his hand into the dish when Jesus spoke.

25. Matthew only. 'Thou hast said.' Qui s'excuse s'accuse. (*Cp.* for the phrase and its usage in the more important passages, xxvi. 64, xxvii. 11; Mark xv. 2.) Thus Jesus openly denounces Judas. Nevertheless the story continues as if so important a word had not been spoken. 'Il est certain que le traître n'a pas été accusé personnellement devant tous ses compagnons. Le rédacteur du premier Évangile a dramatisé la situation, comme il fait assez volontiers. Tous les Évangelistes ont voulu signifier que Judas avait su dissimuler jusqu'à la fin, mais que cependant Jésus avait nettement dénoncé la trahison, et de façon à faire entendre au traître lui-même qu'il n'ignorait rien de ses desseins' (*E. S.* II. p. 517). Historically we may rather believe, that if Judas betrayed Jesus, as there is small reason to doubt, Jesus was to the end quite ignorant of his intentions.

26–29. The Last Supper

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 22–25; Luke xxii. 15–20)

26 And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and said the
blessing, and broke it, and gave it to the disciples, and said,
27 'Take, eat; this is my body.' And he took a cup, and spake the
28 blessing, and gave it to them, saying, 'Drink ye all from it; for
this is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many for the
29 forgiveness of sins. I say unto you, I shall surely not drink from
now of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new
with you in the kingdom of my Father.'

In his narrative of the Last Supper Matthew follows Mark very closely. The only important addition is the words 'for the forgiveness of sins' at the end of 28. The object of his death is the forgiveness of the sins of many. His death is a sin offering. (*Cp.* Heb. ix. 22.) 'No forgiveness without shedding of blood'—

a horrible conception from which the destruction of the Temple enabled Rabbinic Judaism to shake itself entirely free. Holtzmann pertinently notices that whereas Mark had ascribed to John's preaching of repentance the purpose, and hence the power, of effecting a forgiveness of sins, Matthew omits the passage. Matthew's addition, 'for the forgiveness of sins,' is certainly not to be ascribed to Jesus. The conception of his death as a sin-offering only arose after he was dead.

The addition of ἀπ᾽ ἄρτι ('from now') in 29 proves all the more convincingly that Jesus had just drunk of the cup with his disciples. It would be very awkward to refer the words to the drinking of the Passover wine cups, and not to the cup which he had just bidden his disciples partake of. 'With you' is a further addition of Matthew, which does not, however, change the sense.

30–35. JESUS PREDICTS PETER'S DENIAL

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 26–31; Luke xxii. 31–34)

30 And after they had sung the *Hallel*, they went out to the
31 mount of Olives. Then said Jesus unto them, 'Ye will all stumble
because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shep-
32 herd, and the sheep of the flock will be scattered. But after
33 I have risen, I will go before you to Galilee.' Peter answered
and said unto him, 'Though all shall stumble because of thee, yet
34 will I never stumble.' Jesus said unto him, 'Verily I say unto
thee, This night, before the cock crow, thou wilt deny me thrice.'
35 Peter said unto him, 'Even if I must die with thee, I will not
deny thee.' So also said all the disciples.

34. Only one cock-crowing is mentioned.

36–46. GETHSEMANE

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 32–42; Luke xxii. 39–46)

36 Then Jesus came with them unto a place called Gethsemane,
and he said unto the disciples, 'Sit ye here, while I go yonder
37 and pray.' And he took with him Peter and the two sons of
38 Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and troubled. Then said he
unto them, 'My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death:
39 tarry ye here, and watch with me.' And he went a little farther,
and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, 'My Father, if it be

possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will,
40 but as thou wilt.' And he came unto the disciples, and found
them sleeping, and he said unto Peter, 'So ye could not watch
41 with me one hour? Watch and pray, that ye come not into
42 temptation: the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak.' And
again he went away, and prayed, saying, 'My Father, if this
43 cannot pass away unless I drink it, thy will be done.' And he
came and found them asleep again: for their eyes were heavy.
44 And he left them, and went away again, and prayed the third
45 time, saying the same words. Then he came to his disciples, and
said unto them, 'Sleep ye still and take your rest? Behold, the
hour hath drawn nigh, and the Son of man is betrayed into the
46 hands of sinners. Rise up, let us go: lo, he that betrayeth me is
at hand.'

The changes from Mark's narrative are slight and unimportant. In 42 the words, when Jesus prays for the second time, are given. They repeat even more positively the acceptance of the divine will. That Jesus prayed three times is also stated more distinctly (44).

47–56. THE ARREST

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 43–52; Luke xxii. 47–53)

47 And while he yet spoke, lo, Judas, one of the Twelve, came,
and with him a great band with swords and bludgeons from the
48 chief priests and Elders of the people. Now his betrayer had
given them a sign, saying, 'Whomever I kiss, that is he: seize
49 him.' And forthwith he went up to Jesus, and said, 'Hail,
50 master'; and kissed him. And Jesus said unto him, 'Friend,
that for which thou art here, do.' Then came they, and laid
51 hands on Jesus, and seized him. And, behold, one of them who
were with Jesus stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and
52 struck the servant of the high priest, and cut off his ear. Then
said Jesus unto him, 'Put back thy sword into its place: for all
53 they that take the sword shall perish by the sword. Thinkest
thou that I cannot now beseech my Father, and he would straightway
54 give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then
55 should the scriptures be fulfilled, that so it must be?' In that
same hour said Jesus to the band, 'Have ye come out to capture

me with swords and bludgeons, as if against a thief? I sat daily
56 teaching in the temple, and ye seized me not. But all this hath
happened that the writings of the prophets might be fulfilled.'
Then all the disciples forsook him, and fled.

50. In Matthew, unlike Mark, Jesus addresses Judas. The meaning is (1) '(Dost thou kiss me) for the purpose for which, as is obvious, thou art come?' (So W. 'Dost thou kiss me' is understood, because enacted.) Or (2) 'For what thou art here (that do).' (So Holtzmann.) Or (3) 'For what art thou come?' So J. Weiss, but he considers that the Greek words are really untranslatable. Loisy renders as J. Weiss.

52–54. Here, too, the words of Jesus are only in Matthew; but the variant, Luke xxii. 51, must be compared.

That, in Mark, Jesus was not reported to have opposed or rebuked the action of the 'bystander,' or disciple, seemed an omission. Here it is supplied quite in his spirit. (*Cp.* for 52 *b* the same adage in Revelation xiii. 10.) Or: why did not the disciples continue to defend themselves? It was important to emphasize that Jesus's passive attitude of non-resistance was purely voluntary, and that the disciples acted under his orders. Finally, a second and more theological motive is given. To resist would have been not only against the Master's teaching and command, but would have tended to prevent the fulfilment of the divine oracles. For 53, *cp.* Psalm xci. 11.

J. Weiss says that the early communities may have often supported themselves under persecution by this word and example. Would that the lesson had not been so rapidly forgotten! The saying was also a reply to those who judged only by the outward result, and saw in the earthly failure and death of Jesus an argument against the truth and value of his teaching and his cause.

55. 'In that same hour.' A resumptive phrase after the intercalation of 52–54. For the expression *cp.* viii. 13. It means 'at the same time,' and points, W. thinks, to an Aramaic original, inasmuch as Aramaic has no separate term for 'same.'

57–68. THE TRIAL BEFORE THE SANHEDRIN

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 53–65; Luke xxii. 54, 55, 63–71)

57 And they that had seized Jesus led him away to Caiaphas the high priest, where the scribes and the Elders were assembled.

58 But Peter followed from a distance unto the high priest's palace,
and he went in, and sat with the servants, to see the end.

59 Now the chief priests, and all the high court, sought false
60 witness against Jesus, that they might put him to death. But
they found none, though many false witnesses came forward. But
61 at last two men came forward, and said, 'This man said, I am able
to destroy the temple of God, and to build it after three days.'
62 And the high priest arose, and said unto him, 'Answerest thou
63 nothing to that which these bear witness against thee?' But
Jesus held his peace. And the high priest answered and said
unto him, 'I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us
64 whether thou art the Messiah, the Son of God.' Jesus said unto
him, 'Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Soon shall ye
see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of the Power, and
65 coming on the clouds of heaven.' Then the high priest rent
his clothes, saying, 'He has blasphemed; what further need have
66 we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard the blasphemy. What
think ye?' They answered and said, 'He is guilty of death.'

67 Then they spat on his face, and struck him with their fists,
68 and others smote him with sticks, saying, 'Prophesy unto us,
O Messiah, who is it that struck thee?'

57. *συνήχθησαν* ('were collected together') is repeated from xxvi. 3, 'so dass sich daraus fast der Schein einer permanenten Sitzung ergibt' (Holtzmann).

58. 'To see the end' is substituted by Matthew for the somewhat too human touch, perhaps, of Mark, 'warming himself at the fire.'

59. Matthew says that the court searched, not merely for 'witness,' or 'evidence,' but for 'false witness.' But the S.S. has merely: 'they searched for witnesses.'

61. *Cp.* Mark xiv. 58 and notes. What Jesus is reported to have said is here given more briefly and simply. The contrast between the material and spiritual temple—'made with hands' and 'not made with hands'—is not mentioned. I have already mentioned that Loisy thinks it more original than the interpolated version of Mark. *Cp.* Mark xv. 29; Matt. xxvii. 40. 'On pourrait d'ailleurs supposer que Matthieu a connu la source de Marc, où cette parole devait se trouver en sa forme authentique' (*E. S.* II. p. 602).

Another hypothesis would be that Matthew left out the words 'made with hands' and 'not made with hands' to render the words of Jesus more in accordance with what he probably said. Moreover Matthew would not have wished to make Jesus express hostility to the Temple. The witnesses declare that Jesus said that he *could* destroy the Temple: he is not even by them reported to have said that he meant or desired to do so. It is not therefore necessary to assume that Matthew knew the source of Mark.

63. Matthew makes the high priest 'adjure' Jesus, that is, he demands that Jesus should swear, one way or the other, whether he be or be not the Messiah, the Son of God.

64. The commentators differ as to whether Jesus accepts or refuses to accept this oath. J. Weiss says that as the reply is not 'Amen,' or the like, but 'Thou hast said,' this answer is with high probability to be interpreted to mean that he refuses to take the oath. He follows his own command not to swear. Others, *e.g.* Holtzmann and B. Weiss, argue that the reply means an acceptance of the oath laid upon him. The decision partly depends upon the right interpretation of 'Thou hast said,' which is usually regarded as meant by Jesus, and understood by his judges, to be equivalent to the simple 'I am' of Mark. Thus Schanz. 'Mit dem einfachen σὺ εἶπας legt Jesus ein unumwundenes feierliches Bekenntniss ab.' So too most strongly Loisy (*E. S.* II. p. 604, n. 1). On the whole, however, I am more inclined to think that σὺ εἶπας, 'Thou hast said,' is a refusal to reply. A consideration of all the places in which it is used—Matt. xxvi. 25, 64, xxvii. 11; Mark xv. 2; Luke xxiii. 3—together with the highly important variant, Luke xxii. 70, makes this interpretation more likely. Only in Mark does Jesus directly admit and proclaim his Messiahship. Yet it must be noticed that in Matt. xxvi. 25 Jesus says to Judas: 'Thou hast said.' Now, though this may mean, 'I say neither yes nor no,' yet Jesus did believe that Judas had betrayed him. If, then, Jesus says here, 'Thou hast said' in reply to the high priest, analogy might make us think (though the mere words mean, 'I say neither yes nor no'), that yet the implication is that he believed himself to be the Messiah. It is not unreasonable that Mark should have turned an evasive reply into a direct affirmative, seeing that to Mark (as to the other Evangelists) Jesus *was* the Messiah, and was condemned and executed as such. Several reasons of varying validity may be given for Jesus refusing to reply, whether to the Sanhedrin or to Pilate:

(1) It is in accordance with his prevailing line of conduct in dealing with his opponents.

(2) 'His conception of the Messiah was so different from theirs that the same term meant different things to him and to them.

(3) He refused to recognize the competency or right of their tribunals to try his case.

(4) The manifestation and *Verwirklichung* of his Messiahship lay in the future, even though that future was near. Hence it would have been presumptuous to say, '*I am* the Messianic King.' He could only have said, 'I am convinced that God will fulfil His promise to me and through me.' This is the view of J. Weiss, who adds: 'Aber für ein solches Glaubensbekenntniss war hier nicht der Ort; eine nähere Erörterung dieser Dinge in diesem Kreise war ganz ausgeschlossen.'

The clause which follows 'Thou hast said' is the same as in Mark xiv. 62, except that it is prefaced by the not quite easy words *πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ἀπ' ἄρτι*.

πλήν can apparently be translated, 'nevertheless,' 'however,' or 'moreover.' If 'Thou hast said' means 'Yes, I am,' then *πλήν* must mean 'moreover.' If 'Thou hast said' is a refusal to reply, then *πλήν* probably means 'nevertheless.'

ἄρτι is a favourite expression of Matthew. (See xxiii. 39, xxvi. 29, where we have *ἀπ' ἄρτι* as here. *ἄρτι* by itself occurs ix. 18, xi. 12.) What is here meant is not very clear. The literal meaning is 'henceforth,' 'from now.' It is usually said that this 'from now' means from Jesus's death, which is imminent. 'Soon after my death you will see the Son of man as the world judge.'

J. Weiss is also struck with the difficulty of *ἀπ' ἄρτι*. The meaning cannot be, he says, that they will see the Son of man at once and permanently. Perhaps it is a condensed expression for 'from henceforth—you have nothing more to expect than that you will see.' Or perhaps the words are a combination or fusion of Mark's simple 'ye will see,' and Luke's 'from now (*ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν*) the Son of man will sit.' In Mark the high priest is merely referred to the coming Parousia; in Luke the firm conviction is expressed that Daniel's prediction will forthwith be fulfilled in Jesus. Loisy appears to think that the words, which he renders 'désormais,' are intended to get over the difficulty that the prediction will only be realized at the Parousia which is still in the dim future. But can *ἀπ' ἄρτι* mean all this? The verse at any rate does not clearly distinguish between the heavenly glory into which Jesus will enter immediately after his resurrection, and his subsequent, later, manifestation upon the clouds. The two clauses 'sitting upon the right hand of the Power,' and 'coming upon the clouds' are just as coordinated as they are in Mark. Mr Allen says that ἀπ' ἄρτι seems here to be equivalent to 'soon,' 'hereafter.' I am the Messiah, but the Messiah of the future, not of the present; you will understand when you shall see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven. Völter (p. 28), who tries to get rid of as many Son of man passages as possible (except, indeed, where Jesus seems to distinguish himself from the Son of man), regards the words from πλήν as certainly unauthentic. Jesus says evasively, 'Thou hast said.' How could he then go on to say, 'nevertheless' &c.? Mark has smoothed over the difficulty by omitting the πλὴν ἀπ' ἄρτι, and substituting for 'Thou hast said,' 'I am.' The text of Mark is here secondary.

It is not easy to say what was actually meant by the whole passage. Was a real, physical seeing intended? Or is the sitting on the right hand of God merely intended to be a quotation from Psalm cx., and a metaphorical expression for 'invested with divine power'? If, when Mark wrote, the members of the Sanhedrin were mostly dead, does this point to the authenticity of the words attributed to Jesus? For certainly they had *not* seen any such thing. The Son of man had not come, still less had he come 'soon.' Perhaps neither Mark nor Matthew could have given a precise reply as to what he meant by the words. They were mysterious expressions, signifying that, somehow or other, and at some time or other, the old order would end, and the new era begin, with the advent in glory of the Son of man, who, to the Evangelists, was one with the risen Jesus, the Messiah, the Son of God.

65. The S.S. reads 'ye have heard the blasphemy from his mouth.' *Cp.* Luke xxii. 71.

67. Matthew makes the ill-treatment inflicted by the members of the court only. The ῥαπίσματα are given by them, not by the servants. This is the most improbable version of all.

68. Matthew adds to 'prophesy' the words 'who is it that struck thee?' but omits the then necessary 'they covered his face.' Either both must be omitted, or (as Luke) both included.

69–75. THE DENIAL OF PETER

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 66–72; Luke xxii. 56–62)

69 Now Peter sat outside in the courtyard; and a maid came up
70 to him, saying, 'Thou too wast with Jesus of Galilee.' But he

denied it before them all, saying, 'I know not what thou sayest.'
71 And as he went out to the gate, another maid saw him, and said
unto them that were there, 'This man was with Jesus of Nazareth.'
72 And again he denied it with an oath, saying, 'I do not know the
73 man.' And after a little while the bystanders came up, and said
to Peter, 'Surely thou too art one of them; for thy speech betrays
74 thee.' Then began he to curse and to swear, saying, 'I know
75 not the man.' And immediately the cock crew. And Peter
remembered the word which Jesus had said unto him, 'Before the
cock crow, thou wilt deny me thrice.' And he went out, and wept
bitterly.

71. Here, instead of Mark's outer court' (τὸ προαύλιον) Matthew has 'the gate' or 'porch' (τὸν πυλῶνα). Matthew, moreover, has two girls instead of Mark's one.

72. Matthew adds, 'with an oath.'

73. 'Thy speech betrays you.' Instead of Mark's, 'Thou art a Galilæan.'

75. He went out. Not now in fear, but in an agony of shame. For the 'bitter' weeping, *cp.* Is. xxii. 4, xxxiii. 7. For Matthew's version of the denial, *cp.* Loisy, II. p. 619. He shows that Matthew's changes are probably made to render Mark's narrative more convincing or likely. Matthew may have omitted the second crowing for the same reason. But he may conceivably have known Mark's source, or at any rate have been aided in his changes by oral tradition.

CHAPTER XXVII

1, 2. JESUS IS BROUGHT BEFORE PILATE

(*Cp.* Mark xv. 1; Luke xxiii. 1)

1 Now in the early morning all the chief priests and Elders of the people formed their decision against Jesus to put him to
2 death. And having bound him, they led him away, and delivered him up to Pilate the governor.

1. Matthew had not formally stated that the Sanhedrin had passed sentence upon Jesus at the midnight sitting. The phrase he now uses, like the corresponding words in Mark, is also a little vague, and is variously translated. It need not be more than 'took counsel,' as in xii. 14, xxii. 15; or 'determined.' J. Weiss says that Matthew perhaps knew that the Sanhedrin had to leave to the Governor 'das formell gültige Todesurteil.'

3–10. THE DEATH OF JUDAS

(Matthew only)

3 Then Judas, who had betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented, and brought the thirty pieces of silver back
4 to the chief priests and Elders, saying, 'I have sinned by betraying innocent blood.' And they said, 'What is that to us? see to that
5 thyself.' And he threw the pieces of silver into the temple, and
6 departed, and went and hanged himself. And the chief priests took the silver pieces, and said, 'It is not lawful to put them into
7 the treasury, because they are the price of blood.' So they formed a resolution, and bought with them the potter's field, for the burial
8 of strangers. Wherefore that field was called, The field of blood,

9 unto this day. Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by
Jeremiah the prophet, saying, 'And they took the thirty pieces of
silver, the price of the prized one on whom they set a price, from
10 the children of Israel, and I gave them for the potter's field, as
the Lord commanded me.'

The story here told is unknown to Mark and Luke. It is, in all probability, completely legendary; and we can almost see how and from what material it was put together. There is a variant in Acts i. 18, 19. The basis of the story is a mistranslated passage in Zech. xi. 12, 13, wrongly attributed by the Evangelist to Jeremiah.

3. The tale takes up the 'thirty pieces of silver' (Zech. xi. 13) of which we had heard in xxvi. 15.

4. σὺ ὄψῃ. Literally 'Thou wilt see.' That is your business. You must see to what you now have or want to do.

5. He throws the money into the Temple treasury. Here we have evidence that the consonantal text of Zech. xi. 13 read *ozar* ('treasury'), instead of *yozer* ('potter'). This reading is also witnessed to by the Syriac. The hanging seems due to Ahithophel in 2 Sam. xvii. 23.

6. There is no *law* in the Pentateuch according to which they acted. Deut. xxiii. 18 is different.

7. The same words are used as in verse 1 to express their determination: 'they resolved.'

'The potter's field.' Here, oddly enough, the present reading and punctuated text of Zech. xi. 13 come in. Hence the *potter's* field. But Jer. xxxii. 6–15 and xviii. 2 were also vaguely in the mind of those who made up the legend, and hence the passage from Zechariah is attributed to Jeremiah.

8. There was, doubtless, at Jerusalem a cemetery for strangers, or perhaps for criminals, called the 'field of blood,' and hence we get a legendary explanation of a name the true meaning or origin of which was unknown or forgotten. Much time must have elapsed between the crucifixion and the compilation of this narrative. Loisy points out that the field of blood was more probably the place where the bodies of criminals were thrown. 'Ne serait-ce pas là que, d'après les juifs, le corps de Jésus aurait été abandonné?' The Christian tradition, long after the event, and far from Jerusalem, used the field of blood for Judas (*E. S.* II. p. 627, n. 4).

There may also have been a tradition that the ground had aforetime been called the potter's field.

9, 10. The Zechariah passage, as here quoted, is in a peculiar form, unlike the Septuagint or the Hebrew. It is odd that the Hebrew text, as we have seen, was nevertheless used, and is responsible, for the incident of verse 5. The story has probably influenced the text, just as the original text influenced and modelled the story.

There seems a sort of intended play upon words in the Greek. 'The price of the prized one on whom Israelites had set a price' (so Weymouth). Others render: 'I received the 30 pieces of silver—the price of the prized one on whom they set a price—from the Israelites.' *ἔλαβον* may be either, 'they took' or 'I took.' R.V. has 'they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was priced, whom *certain* of the children of Israel did price.' The margin of the R.V. and B. Weiss have: 'the price of him that was priced, whom they priced on the part of the sons of Israel.' In the last clause 'I gave' is the more probably correct reading.

'As the Lord commanded me' corresponds with the opening of the Hebrew in Zech. xi. 13, 'And the Lord said unto me.'

The priests carry out unconsciously the word of God.

11–14. JESUS BEFORE PILATE

(*Cp.* Mark xv. 2–5; Luke xxiii. 2–5)

11 And Jesus stood before the governor: and the governor asked
him, saying, 'Art thou the King of the Jews?' And Jesus said
12 unto him, 'Thou sayest.' And when he was accused by the
13 chief priests and Elders, he answered nothing. Then said Pilate
unto him, 'Hearest thou not how many things they bear witness
14 against thee?' But he did not answer even one of his words, so
that the governor marvelled greatly.

14. The narrative follows Mark somewhat closely. *πρὸς οὐδὲ ἓν ῥῆμα.* R.V. rightly: 'Jesus gave him no answer, not even to one word' (*i.e.* to no word of Pilate, who repeated the charges, did Jesus reply).

15-26. JESUS, PILATE AND BARABBAS

(*Cp.* Mark xv. 6-15; Luke xxiii. 17-25)

15 Now at the festival the governor was wont to release unto
16 the people any one prisoner, whom they wished. And there was
17 then a notable prisoner, called Barabbas. So when they were
gathered together, Pilate said unto them, 'Whom do ye wish me
to release to you? Barabbas, or Jesus who is called Messiah?'
18 For he realized that they had delivered him up out of envy.

19 And while he was sitting on the judgment seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, 'Have thou nothing to do with that righteous man: for I have suffered much to-day in a dream because of him.'

20 But the chief priests and Elders persuaded the people that
21 they should ask for Barabbas, and let Jesus perish. So the
governor answered and said unto them, 'Which of the two do ye
22 wish me to release to you?' They said, 'Barabbas.' Pilate said
unto them, 'What shall I do then with Jesus who is called
23 Messiah?' They all said unto him, 'Let him be crucified.' And
the governor said, 'Why, what evil has he done?' But they cried
out the more vehemently, saying, 'Let him be crucified.'

24 When Pilate saw that he was doing no good, but that the uproar was becoming greater, he took water, and washed his hands before the crowd, saying, 'I am innocent of this blood: see to it yourselves.'

25 Then answered all the people, and said, 'His blood be on us,
26 and on our children.' Then he released Barabbas unto them: but
Jesus he had scourged, and delivered him up to be crucified.

16. Matthew calls Barabbas ἐπίσημος, 'well known.' It is not stated or implied in what way or how he was well known. In the S.S. and some lesser MSS. he is called Jesus Barabbas, and this strange reading was known to Origen. Professor Burkitt, in his edition of the Syriac (Vol. II. p. 278), argues cogently that this was the original reading. It was apparently not known to Mark. 'If Matthew,' says Professor Burkitt, 'got the name "Jesus Barabbas" from an independent source, it may very well have been the source which furnished him with the story of the dream of Pilate's wife.' Doubtless, as the Professor says, to read 'Jesus Barabbas' 'gives point' to 17. 'Which Jesus

shall I release to you?' 'Jesus bar Abba is,' adds Professor Burkitt, 'a perfectly appropriate name for a Jew living in the first century A.D. Several persons mentioned in the Talmud have the name Joshua or Jesus, and several are called Bar Abba after the name of their father.'

17, 18. Pilate takes the initiative. He anticipates the usual demand of the people. Jesus, even if some called him the Anointed One, or King, was no antagonist to the Romans. The Jewish authorities and teachers were envious of his popularity. Pilate is made to see through them. Matthew seems to think that 'Jesus who is surnamed Messiah' would be the sort of phrase which Pilate would have used. In reality, as Loisy points out, Jesus was not 'surnamed' Christ (*i.e.* Messiah) by anyone before his death.

19. The legendary dream of Pilate's wife is only mentioned in Matthew. It intensifies the guilt of the Jews. The heathen woman seeks to save the righteous Jew.

πολλὰ ἔπαθον. She had had frightening dreams, but these dreams are heaven-sent.

20-23 correspond with Mark 11-14. The source is slightly expanded. The Jews are made definitely to ask for the relief of Barabbas.

24, 25. The whitewashing of Pilate and the guilt of the Jews are intensified. Pilate, in Jewish fashion, washes his hands as a sign of his own innocency. The legendary character of this incident is of course obvious. (*Cp.* Deut. xxi. 6, 7; Psalm xxvi. 6, lxxiii. 13.) Pilate's words are modelled on David's in 2 Sam. iii. 28. For 'see to it yourselves,' see xxvii. 4. The Evangelist does not see that if Pilate had acted as he is here supposed to have done, he would have played, as Loisy says, a ridiculous and odious comedy. Matthew cannot in truth hide the facts. Pilate condemned Jesus to death, without reluctance, on the ground that he claimed to be King of the Jews. Pilate was not scrupulous in blood shedding. The condemnation of Jesus did not trouble his conscience or his wife's sleep.

25. A terrible verse; a horrible invention. Note the bitter hatred which makes the Evangelist put πᾶς ὁ λαός. The whole people is supposed to be present. Hence all the shameful atrocities which Christianity and the approving Church have wrought upon the Jews were accepted and invoked upon their own heads by the Jews themselves. This is one of those phrases which have been responsible for oceans of human blood, and a ceaseless stream of misery and desolation.

27–31. JESUS IS MOCKED BY THE SOLDIERS

(*Cp.* Mark xv. 16–20)

27 Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the
28 Prætorium, and collected about him the whole cohort. And
29 they stripped him, and put on him a scarlet mantle. And they
wove a crown of thorns, and put it upon his head, and a cane in
his right hand: and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked
30 him, saying, 'Hail, King of the Jews!' And they spat on him,
31 and took the cane and beat him on the head. And when they
had mocked him thus, they took off the mantle from him, and put
his own clothes on him, and led him away to crucify him.

28. The purple chlamys or cloak is the regal garment of the Emperors.

29. The cane is put in his hand as a mock sceptre.

32–44. THE CRUCIFIXION

(*Cp.* Mark xv. 21–32; Luke xxiii. 26–43)

32 And as they came out, they found a man from Cyrene, Simon
33 by name: him they compelled to carry his cross. And when they
came to a place called Golgotha, that is to say, The place of a
34 skull, they gave him wine to drink mixed with gall: and when he
35 had tasted it, he would not drink it. And they crucified him, and
36 they divided his garments by casting lots. And sitting down
37 they watched him there. And they set up over his head the
charge against him in writing, namely, 'This is Jesus the King
of the Jews.'

38 Then two thieves were crucified with him, one on the right
39 hand, and one on the left. And the passers-by reviled him, wagging
40 their heads, and saying, 'Thou that destroyest the temple, and
buildest it in three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son of God,
41 come down from the cross.' Likewise the chief priests, mocking
42 him with the scribes and Elders, said, 'He saved others; himself
he cannot save. If he be the King of Israel, let him come down
43 now from the cross, and we will believe in him. He trusted in

God; let Him deliver him now, if He delights in him: for he
44 said, I am the Son of God.' The thieves also, who were crucified
with him, reviled him in the same way.

34. The narrative follows Mark somewhat closely.

The 'wine mingled with myrrh,' of which we hear in Mark, is here changed to wine mixed with gall. The change is due to Psalm lxix. 22 (Septuagint). In Mark, the object is to remove consciousness; and J. Weiss is, one hopes, only guilty of an inaccuracy, and not of an unfairness, when he speaks of the humane act of the soldiers. For if the drugged wine incident be historic, it was compassionate Jews who offered it, and not Roman soldiers. In Matthew, the 'humane act' is turned into a mockery. In Mark, Jesus knows the object of the drink, and refuses it in order to die with full consciousness; in Matthew he tries it, but refuses to drink it because of the odious taste.

36. This notice about the guard is not in Mark. But it embodies the usual custom, and is implied in Mark (xv. 39).

40. Matthew adds the words: 'If thou be the Son of God.'

43. Matthew only. Matthew repeats and emphasizes the divine Sonship. The wording is taken from Psalm xxii. 8, and Wisdom of Solomon ii. 18.

45–54. The Death of Jesus

(*Cp.* Mark xv. 33–41; Luke xxiii. 44–49)

45 Now from the sixth hour darkness came over all the land unto
46 the ninth hour. And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a
loud voice, saying, '*Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?*' that is, 'My God,
47 my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' And some of the bystanders, when they heard that, said, 'This man calls Elijah.'
48 And straightway one of them ran, and took a sponge, and filled
it with vinegar, and put it on a cane, and gave him to drink.
49 But the others said, 'Let be, let us see whether Elijah will come
50 to save him.' But Jesus cried again with a loud voice and expired.
51 And, behold, the curtain of the temple was rent in twain from
the top to the bottom; and the earth quaked, and the rocks were
52 cleft in sunder; and the graves opened; and many bodies of the
53 saints who slept arose, and came out of their graves after his

resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto
54 many. But when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and the occurrences, they were exceedingly afraid, saying, 'Truly this man was a Son of God.'

49. J. Weiss thinks that the parallel 34-36 in Mark was probably a later insertion, borrowed and altered (for the worse) from Matthew. For Mark's version assumes that the man who offered the sponge was about to be kept back. He says ἄφετε, 'Let me be.' But only Matthew says clearly that 'the others' wanted to restrain him. It also makes the situation clearer that in Matthew the words 'Let be,' &c. are put into the mouth of the 'others.' They say, 'Let us give him no succour or relief; let us see if Elijah will save him.' In Mark one has to make the rather strained interpretation that the giver of the drink suggests that the object of giving it is that Jesus's life may be prolonged, and that thereby further time may be provided for the chance of the intervention of Elijah.

The giver of the sponge is by Matthew implied to be not one of the soldiers, but a bystander.

51-53. The miracles which accompany Jesus's death are greatly extended and magnified in Matthew's narrative. Thus we have an earthquake and a cleaving of rocks, leading up to the graves bursting open and the dead coming forth. Was this final marvel suggested by Ezek. xxxvii. 12?

53. There is an extraordinary insertion in this verse. The original marvel meant to say that the bodies of the holy men came out of their graves, and were seen in Jerusalem at or immediately after Jesus's death. But this miracle became incompatible with a dogma which Paul and his circle put into circulation. For according to that dogma Jesus was the first to rise from the dead—'the firstfruits of them that are asleep'—(1 Cor. xv. 20). How, then, could these others have risen before Jesus? Hence a harmonist added the words 'after his resurrection.' The holy men did not rise, or, at any rate, were not seen in the capital, till after Jesus's own resurrection. But the correction spoils the whole miracle, the point of which is that it happened simultaneously with Jesus's death.

Who are these ἅγιοι, holy men, or saints? We are not informed. They rise in a semi-material form, visible to the eye, though not to every eye. Jerusalem is still the 'holy' city to the Christian writer as well as to the Jews.

54. Not only the centurion (as in Mark), but his company, observe and are impressed by the marvels. Matthew rejects the interpretation that it was the 'loud cry' which caused the exclamation: 'Truly this man was a son of God.'

The miracle of the dead rising from their graves at critical moments has a number of parallels.

55, 56. THE WOMEN WHO SAW

(*Cp.* Mark xv. 40, 41; Luke xxiii. 49)

55 And many women were there looking on from a distance, who
56 had followed Jesus from Galilee, ministering unto him: among
whom were Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and
Joseph, and the mother of the sons of Zebedee.

For the 'Salome' of Mark, Matthew has 'the mother of the sons of Zebedee.' In all probability the same woman is meant.

57–61. THE BURIAL OF JESUS

(*Cp.* Mark xv. 42–47; Luke xxiii. 50–56)

57 Now when it was evening, there came a rich man of Arimathæa,
named Joseph, who had also himself become a disciple of Jesus.
58 He went to Pilate, and asked for the body of Jesus. Then Pilate
59 ordered that the body should be given up. And Joseph took the
60 body, and he wrapped it in clean linen, and laid it in his own new
sepulchre, which he had hewn out in the rock: and he rolled a
61 great stone to the door of the sepulchre, and departed. And
Mary Magdalene and the other Mary were there sitting opposite
the tomb.

57. Joseph is not called a councillor by Matthew in order to avoid the difficulty that in that case he might be responsible for the condemnation of Jesus. (This difficulty is avoided by Luke in another way.) He now becomes merely a rich man. The adjective may be evolved out of his deed, and is not necessarily due to Isaiah liii. 9. Matthew makes him a regular disciple of Jesus.

58. Mark's narrative is contracted.

60. Matthew definitely says that the grave belonged to Joseph, and was as yet unused.

61. The women sit 'opposite' the tomb and watch the interment.

62-66. Roman Soldiers watch the Grave

(Matthew only)

62 Now the next day, that is the day after the Preparation, the
63 chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate, saying,
'Lord, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet
64 alive, After three days I rise. Command therefore that the
sepulchre be securely guarded until the third day, lest his disciples come and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last deception shall be worse than the
65 first.' Pilate said unto them, 'Ye can have a guard: go and
66 make it as secure as ye know how.' So they went, and made the
sepulchre secure, by sealing the stone and setting a guard.

This curious addition of Matthew's has an obvious origin. When the story of Jesus's resurrection was discussed, the believing Christians asserted that the grave was found empty. The disbelieving Jews retorted that the explanation of this was, not that the body had miraculously risen and got out, but that the disciples had stolen the body away. Hence this story of the watchers was invented to show that the retort of the Jews was impossible (*cp.* xxviii. 11-15). Loisy thinks that the passage referred to in verse 63 is Matt. xii. 40, itself a late redactional addition to the tradition (*E. S.* II. p. 710). The Jewish argument is not alluded to by Paul or in the Acts. It must be tolerably late on this account, and also because it is the complement of the late story of the empty tomb.

62. Matthew also implies that the crucifixion had taken place on a Friday. But the expression 'the day after the Preparation' to mean the Sabbath is very odd. It is an ill-used reminiscence of Mark xv. 42.

63. The invention shows itself rather crudely and awkwardly by the absurd remarks of the Jews, by their remarkable foresight, and, as W. says, by the no less remarkable concurrence of Pilate.

64. 'After three days.' Lake has some interesting passages about the origin of 'on the third day' or 'after three days.' He shows that the 'celebration of the death and resurrection of the god on the third day played a part in the theology connected with Attis, Adonis, Osiris, and probably other deities.' These ideas may have filtered into and had an influence upon Jewish popular thought, and may have helped to create (beside and over and above the O.T. passages in Hosea, &c.) the Christian tradition as to the resurrection date (Lake, pp. 253–265). (Is it not also possible that if Jesus was really crucified on a Friday, and this date was well fixed in the popular mind, the day of the resurrection almost suggested itself? Jesus would rest on the Sabbath; as soon as the Sabbath was over, or when the dawn came, he would come out. At any rate the women could not have gone to anoint the body before Sunday. *Cp.* Clemen, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des neuen Testaments*, p. 152.)

66. The idea of the seal is, doubtless, borrowed from Daniel vi. 17 (Septuagint). Pilate, the soldiers, and the Jews act in excellent concert with each other!

J. Weiss tries to make the best of the legend. He argues with some plausibility that it is not necessarily a deliberate invention, though, of course, quite unhistorical. Its origin may, perhaps, be explained thus: 'Perhaps people said: "If the Sanhedrin was so ready to suggest the slander that the body was stolen, it probably thought of this possibility from the first: did it not then take measures of precaution in advance?" From such reflections the story may have grown up. The judicious historian will not here speak of a deliberate invention, but rather of that uncontrollable process which leads from imagination to conjecture, from conjecture to rumour, and lastly to a firmly accepted tale.' Lake, more suggestively, concludes that the whole incident 'is nothing more than a fragment of controversy, in which each side imputed unworthy motives to the other, and stated suggestions as established facts. Any controversy in any age will supply parallels' (p. 180).

CHAPTER XXVIII

1–10. The Empty Grave

(*Cp.* Mark xvi. 1–8; Luke xxiv. 1–12)

1 But late on the sabbath, as it began to get light toward the
first day of the week, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary came
2 to look at the sepulchre. And, behold, there was a great earth-
quake: for an angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came
3 and rolled back the stone, and sat upon it. His appearance was
4 like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: and for fear of him
5 the keepers shook, and became as dead men. And the angel
answered and said unto the women, 'Fear not ye: for I know
6 that ye seek Jesus, who was crucified. He is not here: for he is
7 risen, as he said. Come, see the place where he lay. And go
quickly, and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead; and,
behold, he goeth before you to Galilee; there shall ye see him:
8 lo, I have told you.' And they departed quickly from the sepulchre
with fear and great joy; and they ran to bring his disciples word.

9 And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them,
saying, 'Hail.' And they came and seized his feet, and did him
10 reverence. Then said Jesus unto them, 'Fear not; go tell my
brethren that they go to Galilee, and there shall they see me.'

1. There are many peculiarities in Matthew's version. He apparently means that the two women went early on Sunday morning to visit the grave. But the opening words of Mark xvi. 1 seem reflected in Matthew's ὀψὲ σαββάτων, which ought to mean late on Saturday afternoon, and do not cohere with the following words, which seem to mean 'towards the dawn.' There are various explanations. Loisy holds that we have in Matthew not a day, but a night scene. The words τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων

must be construed (*cp.* Luke xxiii. 54) to mean: 'at the beginning of Sunday,' *i.e.* at nightfall of Saturday (and not 'at the dawn of Sunday'). Verse 3 suits a night scene far best. So too Merx. The words mean, he thinks, 'in the gloaming towards Sunday,' *i.e.* late on Saturday afternoon, after the Sabbath was over.

Mark mentions three women; Matthew only two. The anointing idea is dropped. It would be impossible, if the precaution taken in xxvii. 62–66 was generally known. 'To see the grave' seems odd after xxvii. 61.

2. The legend is more elaborate than in Mark; but, as J. Weiss remarks, there is still a certain restraint and delicacy. The resurrection of Jesus is not described. Is one to assume that the earthquake and the action of the angel had happened before the women arrive? In that case it is implied that the angel had removed the stone, and that Jesus had already come out. If the angel is supposed to descend in the very presence of the women, we must assume either that Jesus comes forth unseen by the women, or that he had already come forth in spite of the stone. The third hypothesis is taken by Loisy; the second by W. It is a fine instinct that the actual coming forth, the actual rising, is witnessed by none, and is not described by any of the Gospels. The later apocryphal Gospels were not so tactfully reticent.

4. The guards faint; and the women can thus draw near the grave.

5–7. Here Matthew adopts the version of Mark, with very slight variations.

8. To Matthew, or rather to later tradition, the statement of Mark that the women through fear said nothing to the disciples, and thus disobeyed the order given them, is a psychological impossibility; hence he adds 'joy' to 'fear,' and tells us that the women hurried off to fulfil the command of the angel.

9, 10. Only Matthew tells of this appearance of Jesus to the women. The risen Jesus is quite materially conceived. The women can grasp his feet. Jesus merely repeats what the angel had already said. Some argue that the object of the story is to explain and justify the flight of the disciples to Galilee. We may also see in it the beginning of the desire to make the proof of the resurrection happen as soon as possible after the entombment. The words put into the mouth of Jesus are parallel with those put into the young man's or angel's mouth in Mark and already used by Matthew in 5–7. Hence Lake supposes that Jesus is here a doublet of Mark's young man. Matthew adopts in one and the same narrative the view that the young man was an angel and the view that he was the risen Lord himself. (This seems unlikely.) (Lake, p. 85.) The story itself, like Mark xvi. 1–8, implies that the disciples were still in Jerusalem.

11–15. THE GUILE OF THE JEWISH AUTHORITIES

(Matthew only)

11 Now as they were going, behold, some of the guard came into the city, and reported to the chief priests all that had happened.
12 And they assembled together with the Elders, and resolved, and
13 gave much money unto the soldiers, saying, 'Say ye, His disciples
14 came by night, and stole him while we slept. And if this come to the governor's ears, we will persuade him, and make you free
15 of trouble.' So they took the money, and did as they were taught: and this story was spread abroad among the Jews until this day.

This story, the unhistorical character of which is obvious, is the *sequitur* of xxvii. 62–66. Odd ideas, as W. says, are implied in it of a Roman governor and of Roman soldiers. When the Christians said not only that Jesus was risen, but that his tomb was empty, the Jews retorted that, if the tomb were empty, this was due to the body having been stolen by the disciples. The Christian rejoinder is contained in Matthew's story. Both attack and defence are late; they arose when the situation of the tomb was already forgotten, or when no examination on the spot could be made.

13. If they slept, how could they know that it was the disciples who had removed the body? The story is awkwardly composed.

15. 'Until this day.' But 'this day' was many years after the death of Jesus.

16–20. THE APPEARANCE OF THE RISEN MESSIAH IN GALILEE

(Matthew only)

16 But the eleven disciples went into Galilee, to the mountain
17 where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they
18 did him reverence; but some doubted. And Jesus came and

spoke unto them, saying, 'All power hath been given unto me in
19 heaven and on earth. Go ye then, and make disciples of all the
nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the
20 Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that
I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, unto the
end of the Age.'

16. The disciples carry out the order given in 10. They leave Jerusalem and go to Galilee. Historically they went to Galilee, not to see the risen Master in obedience to his words, but to return home in grief, perplexity and fear.

In 10, nothing had been said about a mountain. Another tradition seems to be brought in and followed here. Is this the mountain of the Sermon on the Mount or of the transfiguration? It is, says Loisy, both at once; it is the 'lieu idéal' where the glorified Jesus founds his Church (*E. S.* II. p. 745).

17. The narrative is very condensed or very general. Some think that the words 'some doubted' is an interpolation to make a kind of harmony with Luke xxiv. 37; John xx. 25. But they may be genuine and reflect the tradition that not all the disciples or apostles believed at once in the reality of the visions or in the fact of the resurrection.

18. The words are based upon Daniel vii. 14 (but *cp.* also Matt. xi. 27). The historic Jesus would have been greatly amazed had he been told that such a comprehensive claim was to be put into his mouth. In fact the words spoken are a *résumé* of the Christian faith and of the Church's mission, as the resurrection made them. It is the glorified Christ who instructs future generations (*E. S.* II. p. 748).

19. The date must be somewhat late. The old apostles knew nothing of a command to make all the nations Christian. Jesus devoted himself, and probably desired them to devote themselves, exclusively to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. But now the Jews have rejected and killed their would-be Saviour. And so, the salvation they spurned is to be given broadcast to the world at large. Such would be the meaning of Matthew.

Still more surprising is the order to baptize, and the Trinitarian formula. This is the only mention of the Trinity in the authentic text of the New Testament. But it has been shown by Mr Conybeare that the present reading is probably a late interpolation. Originally the verse ran: 'Go and make disciples (μαθητεύσατε) of all nations in my name, teaching them to observe,' &c. Jesus had never made baptism a condition of discipleship. After his own baptism by John we hear of the rite no more. The history and origin of the conception of the Trinity lie outside the story and the age of Jesus. As Mr Bamford says, Jesus was an ardent and convinced Unitarian.

μαθητεύσατε means here 'convert them to Christianity.'

εἰς τὸ ὄνομα. The old reading had ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου ('in my name'), which would mean both invoking the name of Jesus (and using his authority) and also investing the new adherents with the title of Christians. 'Into (εἰς) the name' seems to mean that the new comers are received into a certain relationship with Jesus, or with those whose name is invoked upon them. They belong by this invocation to his community.

20. The new religion is still, in a certain sense, a legal religion, and the law-giver is Jesus. As W. says, 'the Gospel, the content of which was the crucified and risen Christ, is not mentioned; in its place we have the commands of Jesus. The hope of the second coming recedes before the constant and immediate presence of Jesus among his disciples.' If Jesus was spiritually present, there was less need to crave for his visible reappearance. The constant presence of Jesus among his disciples corresponds with the constant presence of the Shechinah among the Jews. Loisy may not improperly say that the conclusion of Matthew is a 'digne finale,' and the most beautiful of the four. The Christ of Matthew need take no leave of his disciples, for he is and will be always with them. The end of the world has been postponed: first must come the organization of the Christian society, the Christianization of all the earth, a long life of the Christ, present though invisible, in the Church, which is his earthly kingdom. And we recognize the general spirit of the book in the authority of the Church thus finding its sanction in the declared will of the immortal Christ: his permanent presence in the society of the faithful is conceived as the guarantee of that society and of its work and its duration. The Christ, omnipotent and immortal, ever dwelling amid his Church, can rightly and efficaciously say to those who represent and replace Peter and the apostles: 'What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and what things soever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.' The end of Matthew and xvi. 17–19, xviii. 16–20 proceed from the same circle of ideas, and even in the form there are analogies between them (*E. S.* II. p. 754).

LUKE

CHAPTER I

Forasmuch as many have undertaken to draw up a narrative of those things which have been accomplished among us, even as they who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word delivered them unto us, it seemed good to me also, after I had accurately gone through all the facts from their origin, to write them down for thee in their order, most noble Theophilus, that thou mayest realize the sure certainty of the teachings wherein thou hast been instructed.

There was in the days of Herod, the king of Judæa, a certain priest named Zacharias, of the class of Abijah: and his wife was of the daughters of Aaron, and her name was Elisabeth. And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless. And they had no child, because Elisabeth was barren, and they both were far advanced in years.

And it came to pass, that while he was discharging his office of priest before God in the order of his class, the lot fell upon him, according to the custom of the priestly service, to go into the temple of the Lord and to burn the incense. And the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the hour of the incense. And there appeared unto him an angel of the Lord standing on the right side of the altar of incense. And when Zacharias saw him, he was greatly agitated, and fear fell upon him. But the angel said unto him, 'Fear not, Zacharias: for thy prayer hath been heard; and thy wife Elisabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John. And thou shalt have joy her; and they rejoiced with her. And it came to pass, that on the eighth day they came to circumcise the child; and they intended to call him Zacharias, after the name of his father. But his mother answered and said, 'No; but he shall be called John.' And they said unto her, 'There is none of thy kindred that is called by this name.' And they made signs to his father, how he would have him called. And he asked for a writing tablet, and wrote, saying, 'His name is John.' And they marvelled all. And immediately his mouth was opened, and his tongue, and he spoke, and praised God. And fear came on all their neighbours: and all these stories were talked about through all the hill country of Judæa. And all they that heard them laid them up in their hearts, saying, 'What then will this child be!' For the hand of the Lord was with him.

And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Spirit, and prophesied, saying, 'Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David;—as he spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets, who have been from of old;—salvation from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; to show pity to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; the oath which he sware to our father Abraham, to grant unto us, that we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, should serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life. And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Most High: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways; to give knowledge of salvation unto his people in the forgiveness of their sins, because of the tender mercy of our God, whereby the dayspring from on high will visit us, to give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.' And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the wilderness till the day of his manifestation unto Israel.

CHAPTER II

And it came to pass in those days, that a decree was issued from the Emperor Augustus, that there should be a census of the whole world. (This, the first census, took place while Cyrenius was governor of Syria.) And all went to be enrolled, each man to his own city. And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, to Judæa, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem; (because he was of the house and family of David:) to be enrolled with Mary who was betrothed to him and was with child. And it happened that, while they were there, the days were completed for her delivery. And she brought forth her firstborn son, and wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger; because there was no room for them in the inn.

And there were in the same region shepherds in the fields, keeping watch over their flock by night. And an angel of the Lord stood by them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them: and they were sore afraid. And the angel said unto them, 'Fear not: for, behold, I proclaim to you the good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all the people. For unto you hath been born this day in the city of David a Saviour, who is Messiah, Lord. And this is a sign for you; ye shall find a babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, in a manger.' And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men of his favour.'

And it came to pass, when the angels were gone away from them into heaven, the shepherds said one to another, 'Let us now go unto Bethlehem, and see this thing which is come to pass, which the Lord has made known unto us.' And they came with haste, and found Mary, and Joseph, and the babe lying in the manger. And when they had seen it, they made known abroad the word which had been spoken to them concerning this child. And all they that heard it wondered at those things which were told them by the shepherds. But Mary kept all these things in mind, and pondered over them in her heart. And the shepherds her; and they rejoiced with her. And it came to pass, that on the eighth day they came to circumcise the child; and they intended to call him Zacharias, after the name of his father. But his mother answered and said, 'No; but he shall be called John.' And they said unto her, 'There is none of thy kindred that is called by this name.' And they made signs to his father, how he would have him called. And he asked for a writing tablet, and wrote, saying, 'His name is John.' And they marvelled all. And immediately his mouth was opened, and his tongue, and he spoke, and praised God. And fear came on all their neighbours: and all these stories were talked about through all the hill country of Judæa. And all they that heard them laid them up in their hearts, saying, 'What then will this child be!' For the hand of the Lord was with him.

And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Spirit, and prophesied, saying, 'Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David;—as he spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets, who have been from of old;—salvation from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; to show pity to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; the oath which he sware to our father Abraham, to grant unto us, that we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, should serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life. And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Most High: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways; to give knowledge of salvation unto his people in the forgiveness of their sins, because of the tender mercy of our God, whereby the dayspring from on high will visit us, to give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.' And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the wilderness till the day of his manifestation unto Israel.

CHAPTER II

And it came to pass in those days, that a decree was issued from the Emperor Augustus, that there should be a census of the whole world. (This, the first census, took place while Cyrenius was governor of Syria.) And all went to be enrolled, each man to his own city. And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, to Judæa, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem; (because he was of the house and family of David:) to be enrolled with Mary who was betrothed to him and was with child. And it happened that, while they were there, the days were completed for her delivery. And she brought forth her firstborn son, and wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger; because there was no room for them in the inn.

And there were in the same region shepherds in the fields, keeping watch over their flock by night. And an angel of the Lord stood by them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them: and they were sore afraid. And the angel said unto them, 'Fear not: for, behold, I proclaim to you the good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all the people. For unto you hath been born this day in the city of David a Saviour, who is Messiah, Lord. And this is a sign for you; ye shall find a babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, in a manger.' And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men of his favour.'

And it came to pass, when the angels were gone away from them into heaven, the shepherds said one to another, 'Let us now go unto Bethlehem, and see this thing which is come to pass, which the Lord has made known unto us.' And they came with haste, and found Mary, and Joseph, and the babe lying in the manger. And when they had seen it, they made known abroad the word which had been spoken to them concerning this child. And all they that heard it wondered at those things which were told them by the shepherds. But Mary kept all these things in mind, and pondered over them in her heart. And the shepherds returned, glorifying and praising God for all the things that they had heard and seen, as it had been told unto them.

And when the eight days for the circumcision of the child were completed, his name was called Jesus, according as he had been named by the angel before he was conceived in the womb. And when the days of her purification, according to the Law of Moses, were completed, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord; (as it is written in the Law of the Lord, 'Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord';) and to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the Law of the Lord, 'A pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons.'

And, behold, there was a man in Jerusalem, whose name was Simeon; and this man was just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel: and the Holy Spirit was upon him. And it was revealed unto him by the Holy Spirit that he should not see death before he had seen the Messiah of the Lord. And he came by the Spirit into the temple: and when the parents brought in the child Jesus, to do concerning him after the custom of the Law, he took him up in his arms, and blessed God, and said:

'Now releasest thou thy servant, O Lord, in peace, according to thy word, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all the peoples, a light of revelation to the nations, and of glory to thy people Israel.'

And his father and his mother marvelled at what was spoken of him. And Simeon blessed them, and said unto Mary his mother, 'Behold, this child is appointed for the fall and rising again of many in Israel; and for a sign to be opposed, (yea, a sword shall pierce through thy own soul also,) that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed.'

And there was a prophetess, Anna, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Asher: she was of a great age, having lived with an husband seven years from her virginity, and as a widow even for eighty-four years. She departed not from the temple, worshipping with fastings and prayers night and day. And she came up at the same time, and gave thanks unto God, and spoke of the child to all that were waiting for the redemption of Jerusalem.

And when they had accomplished all things according to the Law of the Lord, they returned to Galilee, unto their own city

Nazareth. And the child grew, and waxed strong, being filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him.

Now his parents went to Jerusalem every year at the feast of the Passover. And when he was twelve years old, they went up to Jerusalem after the custom of the feast. And when they had fulfilled the days and were returning, the child Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem; and his parents knew it not. But, supposing that he was in the caravan, they went a day's journey; and they sought for him among their kinsfolk and acquaintance. And when they found him not, they returned to Jerusalem in search of him. And it came to pass, that after three days they found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the Teachers, listening to them, and asking them questions. And all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers. And when they saw him, they were amazed: and his mother said unto him, 'Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold, thy father and I have been seeking thee sorrowing.' And he said unto them, 'Why did ye seek me? did ye not know that I must be in my Father's house?' And they understood not the word which he spoke unto them. So he went down with them, and came to Nazareth, and was subject unto them. And his mother kept all these sayings in her heart. And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and with men.

CHAPTER III

Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of the Emperor Tiberius, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judæa, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Ituræa and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene, Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests, the word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness. And he came into all the country around the Jordan, proclaiming the baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins; as it is written in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet, saying, 'The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. Every valley shall be filled up, and every mountain and hill shall be brought low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough ways shall be made smooth; and all flesh shall see the salvation of God.'

Then said he to the crowds that came out to be baptized of him, 'O generation of vipers, who hath suggested to you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth, then, fruits befitting repentance, and begin not to say to yourselves, We have Abraham for father: for I say unto you that God is able to raise up children unto Abraham from these stones. Already is the axe laid unto the root of the trees: every tree, then, which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.'

And the crowds asked him, saying, 'What, then, shall we do? He answered and said unto them, 'He that hath two coats, let him give a share to him that hath none; and he that hath food, let him do likewise.'

Then came also tax-collectors to be baptized, and they said unto him, 'Master, what shall we do?' And he said unto them, 'Exact no more than that which is ordered you.'

And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, 'And what shall *we* do?' And he said unto them, 'Practise extortion to none, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your pay.'

And as the people were in expectation, and all men were pondering in their hearts about John, whether he might not be the Messiah, John answered, saying unto them all, 'I baptize you with water; but one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose; *he* will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire. His winnowing fan is in his hand to purify his threshing floor, and to gather the wheat into his garner; but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire.' And with many other exhortations he proclaimed the good tidings unto the people.

But Herod the tetrarch, being reproved by him about Herodias his brother Philip's wife, and about all the other wickednesses which he had done, added yet this unto all, that he shut up John in prison.

Now it came to pass, when all the people had been baptized, and Jesus had also been baptized, and was praying, that the heaven was opened, and the Holy Spirit descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, 'Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased.'

And Jesus himself, at the beginning, was about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, the son of Heli, the son of Matthat, the son of Levi, the son of Melchi, the son of Jannai, the son of Joseph, the son of Mattathias, the son of Amos, the son of Nahum, the son of Esli, the son of Naggai, the son of Maath, the son of Mattathias, the son of Semein, the son of Josech, the son of Joda, the son of Joanna, the son of Rhesa, the son of Zerubbabel, the son of Shealthiel, the son of Neri, the son of Melchi, the son of Addi, the son of Cosam, the son of Elmadam, the son of Er, the son of Jesus, the son of Eliezer, the son of Jorim, the son of Matthat, the son of Levi, the son of Simeon, the son of Judas, the son of Joseph, the son of Jonam, the son of Eliakim, the son of Melea, the son of Menna, the son of Mattatha, the son of Nathan, the son of David, the son of Jesse, the son of Obed, the son of Boaz, the son of Salmon, the son of Nahshon, the son of Amminadab, the son of Arni, the son of Admin, the son of Hezron, the son of Perez, the son of Judah, the son of Jacob, the son of Isaac, the son of Abraham, the son of Terah, the son of Nahor, the son of Serug, the son of Reu, the son of Peleg, the son of Eber, the son of Shelah, the son of Cainan, the son of Arphaxad, the son of Shem, the son of Noah, the son of Lamech, the son of Methuselah, the son of Enoch, the son of Jared, the son of Mahalaleel, the son of Cainan, the son of Enos, the son of Seth, the son of Adam, the son of God.

CHAPTER IV

And Jesus being full of the Holy Spirit returned from Jordan, and was driven about by the Spirit in the wilderness, for forty days, tempted by the Devil. And in those days he ate nothing: and when they were ended, he hungered. And the Devil said unto him, 'If thou be the Son of God, say to this stone that it become bread.' And Jesus answered him, saying, 'It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone.' And the Devil, taking him up, shewed unto him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. And the Devil said unto him, 'All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them: for it is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it. If, then, thou wilt do reverence before me, all shall be thine.' And Jesus answered and said unto him, 'It is written, Thou shalt do reverence to the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.' And he brought him to Jerusalem, and set him upon the pinnacle of the temple, and said unto him, 'If thou be the Son of God, throw thyself down from here; for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, to keep thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.' And Jesus answered and said unto him, 'It is said, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' And when the Devil had finished every temptation, he departed from him for a season.

And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee: and the report of him spread through all the region round about. And he taught in their synagogues, and was praised by all.

And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Isaiah. And when he unrolled the book, he found a place where was written: 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor; he hath sent me to proclaim deliverance to the captives, and recovery of sight to the blind, to send away the crushed in liberty, to proclaim an acceptable year of the Lord.' And he folded the book, and he gave it again to the attendant, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him.

And he began to say unto them, 'To-day this scripture which your ears have heard hath been fulfilled.' And all bore him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth. And they said, 'Is not this Joseph's son?' And he said unto them, 'Ye will surely say unto me this proverb, Physician, heal thyself: all that we have heard was done in Capernaum, do also here in thine own country.' And he said, 'Verily I say unto you, No prophet is acceptable in his own country. I tell you of a truth, there were many widows in Israel in the days of Elijah, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, and a great famine was throughout all the land; and unto none of them was Elijah sent, but only to Sarepta in the land of Sidon, unto a heathen. And there were many lepers in Israel in the time of Elisha the prophet; and none of them was cleansed, but only Naaman the Syrian.' And all they in the synagogue, when they heard these words, were filled with wrath. And they rose up, and thrust him out of the city, and led him unto the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might cast him down headlong. But he passed through the midst of them and went his way.

And he came to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and taught them on the sabbath day. And they were amazed at his teaching, for his speech was with power.

And in the synagogue there was a man, who had a spirit of an unclean demon, and he cried out with a loud voice, saying, 'Ha! what have we to do with thee, Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art; the Holy One of God.' And Jesus rebuked it, saying, 'Hold thy peace, and come out of him.' And the demon threw him down in the midst of them, and came out of him, without hurting him. And wonder fell upon them all, and they spoke among themselves, saying, 'What is this word? for with authority and power he commands the unclean spirits, and they come out.' And the report of him went out into every place of the country round about.

And he arose and went out of the synagogue, and entered into the house of Simon. And Simon's wife's mother was suffering with a great fever; and they besought him concerning her. And he stood over her, and rebuked the fever; and it left her: and immediately she arose and waited on them.

Now when the sun was setting, all they that had any sick with divers diseases brought them unto him; and he laid his hands on each of them, and healed them. And demons also came out of many, crying out, and saying, 'Thou art the Son of God.' And he rebuked them, and permitted them not to speak: for they knew that he was the Messiah.

And when it was day, he left the house and went to a lonely place: and the crowds sought him, and came unto him, and tried to keep him so that he should not leave them. But he said unto them, 'I must preach the good tidings of the kingdom of God to other cities also: because for this I was sent.' And he went about preaching in the synagogues of Judæa.

CHAPTER V

And it came to pass, that, as the people pressed upon him, hearkening to the word of God, he stood by the lake of Gennesaret, and he saw two boats lying by the lake: but the fishermen had gone out of them, and were washing their nets. And he went on to one of the boats, which was Simon's, and asked him to put out a little from the land. And he sat down, and taught the people from the boat. Now when he ceased speaking, he said unto Simon, 'Put out into the deep water, and let down your nets for a catch.' And Simon answered and said unto him, 'Master, we have toiled all the night, and have caught nothing: nevertheless at thy word I will let down the nets.' And when they had done this, they inclosed a large number of fish: and their nets began to break. And they beckoned unto their companions who were in the other boat to come and help them. And they came, and filled both the boats, so that they began to sink. When Simon Peter saw it, he fell down at Jesus's knees, saying, 'Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord.' For amazement seized him and all that were with him, at the catch of fish which they had taken: and so too it was with James and John, the sons of Zebedee, who were partners with Simon. And Jesus said unto Simon, 'Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men.' And when they had brought their boats to land, they abandoned everything, and followed him.

And it came to pass, when he was in one of the cities, behold a man full of leprosy: who seeing Jesus fell on his face, and besought him, saying, 'Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.' And he stretched out his hand, and touched him, saying, 'I will: be thou cleansed.' And immediately the leprosy departed from him. And he bade him tell no man: 'but go, and show thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing, according as

Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.' But the report of him spread the more: and great crowds came together to hear him, and to be healed of their sicknesses. But he withdrew himself into lonely places, and prayed.

And it came to pass, one day, as he was teaching, that there were Pharisees and teachers of the Law sitting by, who were come out of every village of Galilee, and Judæa, and Jerusalem: and the power of the Lord was there so that he should heal. And, behold, men brought on a bed a man who was paralyzed; and they tried to bring him in, and to place him before him. And when, on account of the crowd, they could find no way by which they could bring him in, they went up on to the roof, and let him down through the tiles with his bed into the midst before Jesus. And when he saw their faith, he said unto him, 'Man, thy sins are forgiven thee.' And the scribes and the Pharisees began to argue, saying, 'Who is this man who speaks blasphemies? Who can forgive sins, but God alone?' But when Jesus perceived their thoughts, he answered and said unto them, 'What do ye argue in your hearts? Which is easier: to say, Thy sins are forgiven thee; or to say, Rise up and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power upon earth to forgive sins,' (he said unto the paralyzed man,) 'I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy bed, and go home.' And immediately he rose up before them, and took up that whereon he lay, and departed to his home, glorifying God. And utter amazement seized them all, and they glorified God, and were filled with fear, saying, 'We have seen marvellous things to-day.'

And after this he went forth, and saw a tax-collector, named Levi, sitting at the tax-house; and he said unto him, 'Follow me.' And he left all, rose up, and followed him.

And Levi made him a great banquet in his house: and there was a great company of tax-collectors and of others that sat down with them to table. But their scribes and Pharisees murmured against his disciples, saying, 'Why do ye eat and drink with tax collectors and sinners?' And Jesus answered and said unto them, 'The healthy have no need of a physician; but they that are sick. I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.'

And they said unto him, 'The disciples of John fast often, and offer prayers, [and so too the disciples of the Pharisees;] but thine eat and drink.' And he said unto them, 'Can ye make the wedding guests fast, while the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come, when the bridegroom will be taken away from them, and then they will fast in those days.'

And he spoke also a parable unto them: 'No man teareth a piece from a new garment and putteth it upon an old one; for, if he do, he both will tear the new, and the patch from the new will not match with the old. And no man poureth new wine into old wineskins; for, if he do, the new wine will burst the skins, and it will be spilled, and the skins will perish. But new wine must be poured into new skins. And no man having drunk old wine desireth new: for he saith, The old is good.'

CHAPTER VI

And it came to pass on a sabbath day that he went through some corn fields; and his disciples plucked the ears of corn, and ate them, rubbing them in their hands. And some of the Pharisees said, 'Why do ye what is not permitted on the sabbath day?' And Jesus answered and said unto them, 'Have ye not read even that which David did, when he and they who were with him were hungry? How he went into the house of God, and took and ate the shewbread, and gave it also to them that were with him; which is not permitted for any to eat except the priests alone?' And he said unto them, 'The Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath.'

And it came to pass also on another sabbath, that he entered into the synagogue and taught: and a man was there whose right hand was withered. And the scribes and Pharisees kept watching him to see whether he would heal on the sabbath day; that they might find an accusation against him. But he knew their thoughts, and said to the man who had the withered hand, 'Rise up, and stand forward.' And he arose and stood forward. Then said Jesus unto them, 'I ask you: Is it permitted to do good on the sabbath day rather than to do evil? to save life rather than to destroy it?' And looking round on them all, he said unto the man, 'Stretch out thy hand.' And he did so: and his hand was restored. And they were filled with frenzy; and they discussed with one another what they should do to Jesus.

And it came to pass in those days, that he went out on to the mountain to pray, and he passed the whole night in prayer to God. And when it was day, he called unto him his disciples: and from them he chose out twelve, whom he also called apostles; Simon, (whom he also named Peter,) and Andrew his brother, James and John, Philip and Bartholomew, Matthew and Thomas, James the son of Alphæus, and Simon called the Zealot, and Judas the son of James, and Judas Iscariot, who became the betrayer.

And he came down with them, and stood on a level place, together with a large crowd of his disciples, and a great multitude of people from all Judæa and Jerusalem, and from the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon, who came to hear him, and to be healed of their diseases; and they that were troubled with unclean spirits were cured. And all the crowd sought to touch him: for a power went out from him, and healed them all.

And he lifted up his eyes upon his disciples, and said, 'Happy are ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God. Happy are ye that hunger now: for ye shall be satisfied. Happy are ye that weep now: for ye shall laugh. Happy are ye, when men shall hate you, and expel you, and revile you, and reject your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake. Rejoice in that day, and leap for joy: for, behold, your reward is great in heaven: for in the same manner acted their fathers unto the prophets.

'But woe unto you that are rich, for ye have received your consolation. Woe unto you that are now satisfied, for ye shall hunger. Woe unto you that laugh now, for ye shall mourn and weep. Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you, for so did their fathers unto the false prophets.

'But I say unto you who hear, Love your enemies, do good to them who hate you, bless them that curse you, and pray for them who illtreat you. And unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other; and from him that taketh away thy cloak refuse not thy coat also. Give to every man that asketh of thee; and from him that taketh away thy goods ask them not again. And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise. For if ye love them who love you, what favour have ye? for even sinners love those that love them. And if ye do good to them who do good to you, what favour have ye? even sinners do the same. And if ye lend to them from whom ye hope to receive, what favour have ye? even sinners also lend to sinners, to receive as much again. But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing in return; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Most High: for he is good unto the ungrateful and the evil. Be ye therefore pitiful, even as your Father is pitiful.

'Judge not, and ye shall not be judged: condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned: acquit, and ye shall be acquitted. Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom. For with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again.'

And he spoke a parable unto them, 'Can the blind lead the blind? will they not both fall into the ditch? The disciple is not above his master: but he that is quite perfected will be like his master. And why lookest thou at the splinter that is in thy brother's eye, but perceivest not the beam that is in thine own eye? How canst thou say to thy brother, Brother, let me pull out the splinter that is in thine eye, when thou thyself seest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, first pull the beam out of thine own eye, and then thou wilt see clearly to pull out the splinter that is in thy brother's eye.

'For a good tree bringeth not forth rotten fruit; neither doth a rotten tree bring forth good fruit. For every tree is known by its own fruit. For from thorns men do not gather figs, nor from a bramble bush do they pluck grapes. The good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good; and the evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil: for from the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh.

'And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not that which I say? Whoever cometh to me, and heareth my words, and doeth them, I will show you to whom he is like: he is like a man who built an house, and digged deep, and laid the foundation on the rock: and when a flood came, the stream dashed against that house, and could not shake it: for it was well built. But he that heareth, and doeth not, is like a man that built an house upon the ground without a foundation; and when the stream dashed against it, it fell in immediately; and the ruin of that house was great.'

CHAPTER VII

Now when he had ended all his words in the hearing of the people, he entered Capernaum. And a certain centurion's servant, whom he valued, was sick, and about to die. And having heard of Jesus, he sent unto him some elders of the Jews, begging him to come and save his servant. And when they came to Jesus, they besought him earnestly, saying, 'He deserves that thou shouldst do this for him; for he loves our nation, and it is he who has built the synagogue for us.' Then Jesus went with them. And when he was already near the house, the centurion sent friends to him, saying unto him, 'Lord, trouble not thyself: for I am not worthy that thou shouldst come under my roof. Wherefore too I thought not myself worthy to come unto thee: but speak a word, and let my servant be healed. For I also am a man set under authority, having soldiers under me, and I say to this man, Go, and he goes; and to another, Come, and he comes; and to my servant, Do this, and he does it.'

When Jesus heard these words, he marvelled at him, and turned round, and said unto the crowd that followed him, 'I say unto you, Not even in Israel have I found so great faith.' And they that had been sent, on returning to the house, found the servant cured.

And it came to pass the day after, that he went to a city called Nain; and many of his disciples went with him, and a great crowd. Now when he came near the gate of the city, behold, a dead man was being carried out, the only son of his mother, and she was a widow: and many people of the city were with her. And when the Lord saw her, he felt compassion for her, and he said unto her, 'Weep not.' And he came and touched the bier: and they that bore it stood still. And he said, 'Young man, I say unto thee, Arise.' And the dead man sat up, and began to speak. And Jesus gave him to his mother. And fear seized them all: and they glorified God, saying, 'A great prophet has risen up among us; God has visited his people.' And this report about him went forth throughout all Judæa, and throughout all the region round about.

And the disciples of John told him of all these things. And John called unto him two of his disciples, and sent them to Jesus, saying, 'Art thou he that is to come? or are we to wait for another?' When the men had come unto him, they said, 'John the Baptist has sent us unto thee, saying, Art thou he that is to come? or are we to wait for another?' And in that same hour he cured many of sicknesses and afflictions and of evil spirits; and unto many that were blind he gave sight. And Jesus answered and said unto them, 'Go, and tell John what ye have seen and heard; the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and the poor receive the good tidings. And happy is he who findeth no stumbling-block in me.'

And when the messengers of John departed, he began to speak unto the people concerning John: 'Why went ye out into the wilderness? To see a reed shaken with the wind? Or why went ye out? To see a man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they who wear grand clothing and live luxuriously are in the palaces of kings. Or why went ye out? To see a prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet. This is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee. I say unto you, Among those that are born of women none is greater than John the Baptist: yet he that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he.'

And all the people that heard him, and the tax-collectors, justified God, and were baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and the teachers of the Law rejected the purpose of God towards themselves, and would not be baptized by him.

'To whom then shall I liken the men of this generation? and to what are they like? They are like unto children sitting in the market-places, who call to one another, and say, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have made lamentation, and ye have not wept. For John the Baptist hath come, neither eating bread nor drinking wine; and ye say, He has a demon.

The Son of man hath come eating and drinking; and ye say, Behold a glutton, and a wine-bibber, a friend of tax-collectors and sinners! And wisdom is justified by all her children.'

And one of the Pharisees asked him to eat with him. And he went into the Pharisee's house, and sat down to table. And, behold, a woman in the city, who was a sinner, learnt that Jesus sat at table in the Pharisee's house. And she brought an alabaster box of ointment, and stood behind, at his feet, weeping, and began to wash his feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hair of her head, and kept kissing his feet, and anointing them with the ointment.

Now when the Pharisee who had invited him saw it, he said to himself, 'This man, if he were a prophet, would know who and what sort of woman it is who is touching him: for she is a sinner.' And Jesus answered and said unto him, 'Simon, I have something to say to thee.' And he said, 'Speak, Master.' 'There was a certain moneylender who had two debtors: the one owed five hundred pieces of silver, and the other fifty. As they were unable to pay, he remitted it to them both. Which, then, of them will love him most?' Simon answered and said, 'I suppose the one to whom he remitted most.' And he said unto him, 'Thou hast rightly judged.'

And he turned to the woman, and said unto Simon, 'Seest thou this woman? I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no water for my feet: but she hath washed my feet with tears, and wiped them with her hair. Thou gavest me no kiss: but she, since I came in, hath not ceased to kiss my feet. My head with oil thou didst not anoint: but she hath anointed my feet with ointment. Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which were many, have been forgiven, for she loved much: [but he to whom little is forgiven, loveth little.]' And he said unto her, 'Thy sins are forgiven.' And they that sat at table with him began to say to themselves, 'Who is this that even forgives sins?' And he said to the woman, 'Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace.'

CHAPTER VIII

And it came to pass afterwards, that he went from city to city and from village to village, preaching and proclaiming the good tidings of the kingdom of God. And the Twelve were with him, and certain women, who had been healed of evil spirits and sicknesses, Mary called Magdalene, from whom seven demons had gone out, and Joanna the wife of Chuza Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, who supported and attended to them from their property.

And as a large crowd came together, and people flocked to him from every city, he spoke by a parable: 'A sower went out to sow his seed: and as he sowed, some seed fell by the way side; and it was trodden down, and the birds of the air ate it up. And some fell upon a rock; and as soon as it had sprung up, it withered away, because it had no moisture. And some fell among thorns; and the thorns grew up with it, and choked it. And some fell upon good ground, and sprang up, and bore a crop, an hundredfold. And when he had said these words, he cried, 'He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.'

And his disciples asked him, saying, 'What may this parable mean?' And he said, 'Unto you it hath been given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God: but to the others in parables; that seeing they may not see, and hearing they may not understand. This, then, is the parable: The seed is the Word of God. Those by the way side are they that hear; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the Word from their hearts, that they may not believe and be saved. They upon the rock are they, who, when they hear, receive the Word with joy; and these have no root; for a while they believe, and in time of temptation they fall away. And the seed which fell among thorns are they, who, when they have heard, go forth, and are choked by the cares and riches and pleasures of life, and they bring no fruit to perfection. But the seed on the good ground are they, who having heard the Word with a right and good heart, hold it fast, and bring forth fruit with endurance.

'No man, when he hath lighted a lamp, covereth it with a vessel, or putteth it under a bed; but he putteth it on a lampstand, that they who enter in may see the light. For nothing is hid which shall not become disclosed; neither is any thing kept secret which shall not be known and come to light. Take heed, then, how ye hear: for whoever hath, to him shall be given; and whoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he seemeth to have.'

Then came to him his mother and his brothers, and they could not get to him on account of the crowd. And it was told him: 'Thy mother and thy brothers stand without, desiring to see thee.' And he answered and said unto them, 'My mother and my brothers are they who hear the word of God, and do it.'

Now it came to pass on a certain day, that he went on to a boat with his disciples: and he said unto them, 'Let us cross over unto the other side of the lake.' So they put forth. But as they were sailing, he fell asleep: and a storm of wind came down upon the lake; and they were filled with water, and were in danger. And they came to him, and awoke him, saying, 'Master, master, we perish.' Then he arose, and rebuked the wind and the surge of the water: and they ceased, and there was a calm. And he said unto them, 'Where is your faith?' And they were afraid and wondered, saying to one another, 'Who is this man that he commands even the winds and the water, and they obey him?'

And they put in at the country of the Gerasenes, which is over against Galilee. And when he had landed, a man met him from the city who was possessed by demons, and for a long time had worn no clothes, and abode in no house, but among the tombs. When he saw Jesus, he cried out, and fell down before him, and with a loud voice said, 'What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High? I beseech thee, torment me not.' (For he had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man. For oftentimes it had seized him: and when he was guarded and bound with chains and in fetters, he would break the bonds, and be driven by the demon into the desert.) And Jesus asked him, saying, 'What is thy name?' And he said, 'Legion': because many demons had entered into him. And they besought him that he would not command them to go down into hell below.

And there was there an herd of many swine feeding on the mountain: and they besought him that he would allow them to enter into them. And he allowed them. And the demons went out of the man, and entered into the swine: and the herd rushed down the cliff into the lake, and were drowned. And when the swineherds saw what had happened, they fled, and told the story in the city and in the country. And they came out to see what had happened; and they came to Jesus, and found the man, out of whom the demons had departed, sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed, and in his right mind: and they were afraid. And the eyewitnesses told them how the man that was possessed by the demons was healed. And all the people of the district around the Gerasenes besought him to depart from them; for they were seized with great fear. So he embarked on to the boat, and returned.

Now the man out of whom the demons had departed besought him that he might remain with him: but Jesus sent him away, saying, 'Return to thine own home, and tell what great things God hath done unto thee.' So he went away, and proclaimed throughout the whole city what great things Jesus had done unto him.

And it came to pass, that, when Jesus returned, the crowd received him: for they were all waiting for him. And, behold, there came a man named Jairus, and he was a ruler of the synagogue: and he fell down at Jesus's feet, and besought him that he would come to his house: for he had a daughter, about twelve years of age, his only child, and she was dying.

But as he went the crowd pressed round him. And a woman who had had an issue of blood twelve years, and had spent all her fortune upon physicians, while none of them had been able to heal her, came behind him, and touched the tassel of his garment: and immediately her issue of blood stopped. And Jesus said, 'Who touched me?' When all denied, Peter and they that were with him said, 'Master, the crowd hang on thee, and press around thee.' But Jesus said, 'Somebody has touched me; for I know that power has gone out of me.' And when the woman saw that she had not remained unnoticed, she came trembling, and falling down before him, she told him before all the people for what cause she had touched him, and how she was healed immediately. And he said unto her, 'Daughter, thy faith hath healed thee; go in peace.'

While he yet spoke, some one came from the ruler of the synagogue's house, saying, 'Thy daughter is dead; trouble not the Master any more.' But when Jesus heard it, he answered him, saying, 'Fear not: only have faith, and she will be healed.' And when he came into the house, he allowed no man to go in, except Peter, and James, and John, and the father and the mother of the child. And all were weeping, and were bewailing her: but he said, 'Weep not; she is not dead, but sleeps.' And they laughed him to scorn, knowing that she was dead. But he took her hand, and called, saying, 'Maiden, arise.' And her spirit came back, and she arose straightway: and he commanded that something should be given her to eat. And her parents were quite beside themselves: but he bade them tell no one what had happened.

CHAPTER IX

And he called his twelve disciples together, and gave them power and authority over all demons, and to cure diseases. And he sent them to proclaim the kingdom of God, and to heal. And he said unto them, 'Take nothing for your journey, neither staff nor wallet, neither bread nor money; neither have two coats apiece. And into whatever house ye enter, there abide, and thence depart. And whoever will not receive you, go out of that city, and shake off the dust from your feet as a testimony against them.' And they departed, and went through village after village, preaching the gospel, and healing everywhere.

Now Herod the tetrarch heard of all that was happening; and he was perplexed, because it was said by some that John was raised from the dead; and by some that Elijah had appeared; and by others that one of the old prophets had risen again. And Herod said, 'John have I beheaded: but who is this, of whom I hear such things?' And he sought to see him.

And the apostles returned and told him all that they had done. And he took them, and retired with them alone to a city called Bethsaida. But the people perceived it and followed him: and he received them, and spoke unto them of the kingdom of God, and them that had need of healing he cured. And when the day began to wane, the Twelve came, and said unto him, 'Send the people away, that they may go into the villages and farms round about, and lodge, and find food; for we are here in a lonely place.' But he said unto them, 'Give ye them to eat.' And they said, 'We have no more than five loaves and two fishes; unless we should ourselves go and buy food for all this people.' (For they were about five thousand men.) But he said to his disciples, 'Make them sit down by companies of fifty.' And they did so, and made them all sit down. Then he took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he said the blessing over them, and broke them, and gave them to the disciples to set before the people. And they ate and were satisfied: and there was taken up of fragments that were left over by them twelve baskets.

And it came to pass, as he was praying alone, his disciples were with him: and he asked them, saying, 'Whom do the people say that I am?' They answered and said, 'John the Baptist; and others, Elijah; and others, that one of the old prophets is risen again.' And he said unto them, 'But ye—whom say ye that I am?' And Peter answered and said, 'The Messiah of God.' And he sternly admonished and commanded them to tell this to no one; saying, 'The Son of man must suffer much, and be rejected by the Elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and on the third day be raised.'

And he said to them all, 'If any man would walk after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me. For whoever would save his life shall lose it: but whoever would lose his life for my sake he shall save it. For what can it profit a man if he gain the whole world, but hath lost or forfeited himself? For whoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in his own glory, and in his Father's, and the holy angels'. But I tell you of a truth, there are some of those standing here who shall not taste death until they see the kingdom of God.'

And it came to pass, about eight days after these sayings, that he took with him Peter and John and James, and went up on to the mountain to pray. And as he prayed, the appearance of his face was changed, and his raiment became white and shining. And, behold, two men were talking with him, who were Moses and Elijah: they appeared in glory, and spoke of his end which he was about to fulfil at Jerusalem. But Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep: and when they woke up they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him. And it came to pass, as they were parting from him, Peter said unto Jesus, 'Master, it is good for us to be here: let us make three tents; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah'—not knowing what he said. While he thus spoke, there came a cloud, and overshadowed them: and they feared as they entered into the cloud. And a voice came out of the cloud, saying, 'This is my chosen Son: hear him.' And as the voice passed, Jesus was found alone. And they kept silence, and told no man in those days of anything which they had seen.

And it came to pass, on the next day, as they came down from the mountain, that a large crowd met him. And, behold, a man from the crowd cried out, saying, 'Master, I beseech thee, look upon my son: for he is mine only child. And, lo, a spirit seizes him, and he suddenly screams; and it tears him so that he foams, and leaves him only with reluctance, after bruising him sorely. And I besought thy disciples to cast it out; but they could not.' And Jesus answering said, 'O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you, and bear with you? Bring thy son hither.' And while he was coming, the demon tore him and convulsed him. And Jesus rebuked the unclean spirit, and he healed the child, and gave him back to his father. And they were all amazed at the mighty power of God.

But while all marvelled at all the things which he did, he said unto his disciples, 'As for you, put these words into your ears: the Son of man will be delivered into the hands of men.' But they understood not this saying, and it was hidden from them, in order that they should not perceive it: and they were afraid to ask him about this saying.

And a dispute arose among them, as to which of them was the greatest. And Jesus, knowing the thought of their heart, took a child by the hand, and set him by him, and said unto them, 'Whoever receiveth this child in my name receiveth me: and whoever receiveth me receiveth him that sent me: for who is least among you all, he is great.'

And John answered and said, 'Master, we saw one casting out demons in thy name; and we prevented him, because he does not follow us.' And Jesus said unto him, 'Prevent him not: for he that is not against us is for us.'

And it came to pass, when the days for his being taken up (into heaven) were fulfilled, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem. And he sent messengers before him, and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to prepare for him. And they did not receive him, because his face was turned to go to Jerusalem. And when his disciples James and John saw it, they said, 'Lord, wouldst thou that we bid fire to come down from heaven, and consume them?' But he turned, and rebuked them. And they went to another village.

And as they went on their way, a man said unto him, 'Lord, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.' And Jesus said unto him, 'The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.' And he said unto another, 'Follow me.' But he said, 'Lord, allow me first to go and bury my father.' But Jesus said unto him, 'Let the dead bury their dead: but go thou and proclaim the kingdom of God.' And another also said, 'Lord, I will follow thee; but first permit me to take farewell of those at my home.' And Jesus said unto him, 'No man, who hath put his hand to the plough, and then looketh back, is fit for the kingdom of God.'

CHAPTER X

After these things the Lord appointed yet seventy others, and sent them two and two before him unto every city and place, whither he himself intended to go. And he said unto them, 'The harvest is large, but the labourers are few: beseech, therefore, the Lord of the harvest that he send out labourers into his harvest. Go forth; behold, I send you out as lambs in the midst of wolves.

Carry neither purse, wallet, nor shoes: and salute no man on the way. And into whatever house ye enter, first say, Peace be to this house. And if a son of peace be there, your peace will rest upon him: if not, it will return to you. And remain in the same house, eating and drinking what is theirs: for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house.

'And into whatever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat what is set before you: and heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them, The kingdom of God hath come nigh unto you. But into whatever city ye enter, and they receive you not, go out into its streets, and say, Even the very dust of your city, which cleaveth to us, we do wipe off against you: yet know this, that the kingdom of God hath come nigh. But I say unto you that it shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom, than for that city.

'Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which have been done in you, they would have long ago repented, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. But it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the Judgment than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which wast exalted unto heaven, shalt be thrust down unto Hades. He that heareth you heareth me; and he that rejecteth you rejecteth me; and he that rejecteth me rejecteth him that sent me.'

And the seventy returned with joy, saying, 'Lord, even the demons became subject unto us in thy name.' And he said unto them, 'I beheld Satan fall as lightning from heaven. Behold, I have given unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: and in nothing shall it injure you at all. Notwithstanding in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but rejoice that your names are written in heaven.'

In that hour Jesus rejoiced in the Holy Spirit, and said, 'I praise thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and the clever, and hast revealed them unto the simple. Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight. All was delivered unto me by my Father: and no man knoweth who the Son is, except the Father; and who the Father is, except the Son, and him to whom the Son would reveal him.'

And he turned unto the disciples, and said privately, 'Happy are the eyes which see what ye see: for I say unto you, that many prophets and kings have desired to see what ye see, and have not seen; and to hear what ye hear, and have not heard.'

And, behold, a teacher of the Law came forward and tempted him, saying, 'Master, what must I do to inherit eternal life?' He said unto him, 'What is written in the Law? how readest thou?' And he answered and said, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself.' And he said unto him, 'Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live.'

But he, desiring to justify himself, said unto Jesus, 'And who is my neighbour?' And Jesus answered, saying, 'A man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves, who stripped him, and beat him, and departed, leaving him half dead. And by chance a priest came down that way: and he saw him, and passed by. And likewise a Levite came to that place, and he too saw, and passed by. But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was: and he saw and had compassion. And he went up to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring on oil and wine, and set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him. And on the morrow he took out two pieces of silver, and gave them to the innkeeper, and said unto him, Take care of him; and whatever thou spendest more, when I come back again, I will repay thee. Which now of these three, thinkest thou, was a neighbour unto him that fell among the thieves?' And he said, 'The one that shewed him pity.' Then said Jesus unto him, 'Go, and do thou likewise.'

Now it came to pass, in the course of their journeying, that he entered into a certain village: and a woman named Martha received him into her house. And she had a sister called Mary, who seated herself at the feet of the Lord, listening to his words. But Martha was agitated about all the service, and she came up to Jesus, and said, 'Lord, dost thou not care that my sister has left the serving to me alone? Tell her, then, to help me.' And Jesus answered and said unto her, 'Martha, Martha; [thou art anxious and troubled about many things: of one thing (only) there is need :] Mary hath chosen the good part, from which she must not be drawn away.'

CHAPTER XI

And it came to pass, that, as he was praying in a certain place, when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, 'Lord, teach us to pray, as John too taught his disciples.' And he said unto them, 'When ye pray, say, Father, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we ourselves forgive all who are in debt to us. And lead us not into temptation.'

And he said unto them, 'If one of you have a friend, and go unto him at midnight, and say unto him, Friend, lend me three loaves; for a friend of mine hath come on his journey to me, and I have nothing to set before him. Will he from within answer and say, Trouble me not: the door is already shut, and my children are with me in bed; I cannot rise and give to thee. I say unto you, Even if he will not rise and give to him because he is his friend, yet because of his importunity he will rise and give him as much as he needeth.

'And I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. If a son shall ask for bread from any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if he ask for a fish, will he give him a serpent? or if he ask for an egg, will he give him a scorpion? If then ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more will your Father from heaven give of the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?'

And he cast out a demon, and it was dumb. And it came to pass, when the demon had gone out, the dumb man spoke; and the people marvelled. But some of them said, 'He casts out demons through Beelzebul the lord of the demons.' And others, tempting him, demanded from him a sign from heaven. But he, knowing their thoughts, said unto them, 'Every kingdom divided against itself is ruined, and one house falleth upon another. If Satan also be divided against himself, how can his kingdom endure? because ye say that I cast out the demons through Beelzebul. And if I by Beelzebul cast out demons, by whom do your sons cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges. But if I through the finger of God cast out the demons, then the kingdom of God hath already come unto you. When a strong man armed guardeth his palace, his goods are in peace: but when a stronger than he cometh upon him, and conquereth him, he taketh from him all his armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils. He that is not with me is against me: and he that gathereth not with me scattereth.

'When the unclean spirit has gone out of a man, it walks through waterless places, seeking rest; and finding none, it says, I will return unto my house whence I went out. And when it has entered, it finds it swept and garnished. Then it goes and takes with it seven other spirits more wicked than itself; and they enter in, and dwell there: and the last state of that man becomes worse than the first.'

And it came to pass, as he spoke these words, a woman from the crowd lifted up her voice, and said unto him, 'Happy is the womb that bore thee, and the breasts which thou hast sucked.' But he said, 'Yea, but happy rather are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.'

And when a crowd of people was gathered together, he began to say, 'This generation is a wicked generation: it seeketh a sign; and no sign shall be given it but the sign of Jonah the prophet. For as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation. The queen of the south shall appear as accuser of this generation, and condemn it: for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, more than Solomon is here. The men of Nineve shall appear as accusers of this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and, behold, more than Jonah is here.

'No man, when he hath lighted a lamp, putteth it in a secret place, or under the bushel, but on the lampstand, that they who come in may see the light. The lamp of the body is thine eye:

when thine eye is single, thy whole body is light; but when thine eye is bad, thy body also is dark. Take heed, then, that the light in thee be not darkness. If, then, thy whole body be light, having no part dark, it will be wholly light, as when the lamp with its bright shining doth give thee light.'

And as he spoke, a Pharisee asked him to dine with him: and he went in, and sat down to table. And the Pharisee wondered when he saw that he had not first washed before dinner. But the Lord said unto him, 'Now ye Pharisees cleanse the outside of the cup and the dish; but your inward part is full of extortion and wickedness. Ye fools, doth not he that cleaneth that which is inward clean that which is outward also? But rather cleanse what is within, and, behold, all things are clean unto you.

'But woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye pay tithe from mint and rue and all manner of herbs, and neglect justice and the love of God: these ought ye to do, though not to leave the other undone. Woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye love the first seats in the synagogues and greetings in the market-places. Woe unto you, for ye are as graves which are not seen, so that men walk over them without knowing it.'

Then answered one of the teachers of the Law, and said unto him, 'Master, in speaking thus thou insultest us also.' But he said, 'Woe unto you also, ye teachers of the Law; for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers. Woe unto you! for ye build the tombs of the prophets, and your fathers killed them. Thus ye bear witness and consent to the deeds of your fathers: for they killed them, and ye build their tombs. Therefore also the Wisdom of God said, I will send them prophets and apostles, and some of them they will slay and persecute: that the blood of all the prophets, which hath been shed from the foundation of the world, may be required from this generation; from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, who perished between the altar and the temple: yea I say unto you, It shall be required from this generation. Woe unto you, ye teachers of the Law, for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye have not entered in yourselves, and those who wanted to enter in ye have prevented.'

And when he had departed thence, the scribes and the

Pharisees began to press him urgently, and to question him about many things, laying wait for him to catch something out of his mouth.

CHAPTER XII

In the mean time, thousands of people having gathered together, so that they trod upon one another, he began to say unto his disciples first of all, 'Beware of the leaven, that is the hypocrisy, of the Pharisees. For there is nothing hidden which shall not be disclosed, or concealed which shall not be known. Therefore whatever ye have spoken in the darkness shall be heard in the light; and that which ye have spoken in the ear in a chamber shall be proclaimed upon the housetops. But I say unto you my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that can do no more. But I will show you whom ye must fear: fear him, who after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him. Are not five sparrows sold for two pennies? and not one of them is forgotten before God. But even the hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not therefore: ye are of more value than many sparrows.

'I say unto you, Whoever shall acknowledge me before men, him shall the Son of man also acknowledge before the angels of God: but he that denieth me before men shall be denied before the angels of God. And whoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whoever blasphemeth against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven.

'And when they bring you before the synagogues and the magistrates and authorities, be not anxious how or what ye shall answer, or what ye shall say: for the Holy Spirit will teach you in that very hour what ye ought to say.'

And some one from the crowd said unto him, 'Master, tell my brother to divide the inheritance with me.' And he said unto him, 'Man, who made me a judge or an arbitrator over you?'

And he said unto them, 'Take heed, and beware of all covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth.'

And he spoke a parable unto them, saying, 'The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully: and he argued within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have no room where to store my crops? And he said, This will I do: I will pull down my barns, and build bigger ones; and there will I store all my produce and my goods. And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast many goods laid up for many years; rest, eat, drink, and be merry. But God said unto him, Fool, this night they will demand thy soul from thee: and whose shall be what thou hast prepared? So is it with him who storeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God.'

And he said unto his disciples, 'Therefore I say unto you, Be not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat; nor for your body, what ye shall put on. The life is more than the food, and the body than clothing. Observe the ravens: for they neither sow nor reap; they have neither storehouse nor barn; and God feedeth them: how much more are ye worth than the birds! And which of you by anxious care can add one cubit unto his height? If ye then cannot do that which is least, why are ye anxious about the rest? Observe the lilies, how they neither spin nor weave; and yet I say unto you that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. If then God so clothe the herbs in the field, which to-day are, and to-morrow are thrown into the oven; how much more will he clothe you, O ye of little faith? And seek not ye what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, neither be ye troubled with anxiety. For after all these things do the nations of the world seek: and your Father knoweth that ye need these things. But rather seek ye the kingdom of God; and all these things shall be added unto you. Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.

'Sell what ye possess, and give alms; make for yourselves bags which grow not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth destroyeth. For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.

'Let your loins be girt, and your lamps burning. And be ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord to return from the wedding; so that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately. Happy are those servants, whom the lord when he cometh shall find watching: verily I say unto you, that he will gird himself, and make them to sit down to table, and will go round and serve them. And if he come in the second or in the third watch, and find them so, happy are they. But know this, that if the master of the house had known at what hour the thief would come, he would not have allowed his house to be broken into. So be ye too ready: for at an hour when ye do not expect it, the Son of man will come.'

Then Peter said unto him, 'Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or also to all?' And the Lord said, 'Who then is the faithful and wise steward, whom his lord will set over his household, to give them their measure of food in due season? Happy is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Of a truth I say unto you, that he will set him over all his possessions. But if that servant say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; and if he begin to beat the menservants and the maidservants, and to eat and drink and to be drunken; the lord of that servant will come on a day when he looketh not for him, and at an hour which he doth not know, and he will cut him in two, and will appoint his portion with the unbelievers.

'And that servant, who knew his lord's will, and prepared not, or did not according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes. But he that knew not, and did what deserved stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. For unto whom much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have entrusted much, of him they will ask the more.

'I have come to throw a fire upon the earth; and how I wish it were already kindled. I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I distressed till it be accomplished! Do ye think that I have come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather dissension. For from henceforth five in one house will be divided, three against two, and two against three. Father will be divided against son, and son against father; mother against daughter, and daughter against mother; mother in law against her daughter in law, and daughter in law against her mother in law.'

And he said also to the people, 'When ye see a cloud rise in the west, straightway ye say, Rain cometh, and so it happeneth.

And when the south wind bloweth, ye say, There will be heat; and it cometh to pass. Hypocrites, ye know how to discern the face of the sky [and of the earth]; how then do ye not discern this time?

'And why can ye not of yourselves judge what is right? When thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate, whilst thou art yet on the way, take pains to be freed from him; lest he drag thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer throw thee into prison. I tell thee, thou shalt surely not come out thence till thou hast paid the very last farthing.'

CHAPTER XIII

At that time some came to tell him of the Galilæans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices. And Jesus answered and said unto them, 'Do ye think that these Galilæans were greater sinners than all the other Galilæans, because these things befell them? I tell you, Nay: but, unless ye repent, ye shall all perish likewise. Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and killed them, think ye that they were more guilty than all the other inhabitants of Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay: but, unless ye repent, ye shall all perish likewise.'

He spoke also this parable: 'A man had a fig tree planted in his vineyard; and he came and sought fruit thereon, and found none. Then said he unto the dresser of his vineyard, Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree, and find none: cut it down; why should it make the very ground useless? And the vinedresser answered and said unto him, Lord, let it alone this year also, till I shall have dug round it, and put manure on it. Then, in the future, if it bear fruit, well; and if not, cut it down.'

And as he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the sabbath, behold, there was a woman who had a spirit of weakness eighteen years, and she was crooked, and could not quite raise herself up. And when Jesus saw her, he called her, and said unto her, 'Woman, thou art released from thy weakness,' and he laid his hands upon her. And immediately she was made straight, and glorified God. But the ruler of the synagogue was indignant that Jesus had healed on the sabbath, and said unto the people, 'There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the sabbath day.' But the Lord answered him, and said, 'Ye hypocrites, doth not each of you on the sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away and water him? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, to be loosed from this chain on the sabbath day?' And when he had said these things, all his adversaries were ashamed: but all the people rejoiced at all the glorious things that were done by him. So he said, 'What is the kingdom of God like? and with what shall I compare it? It is like a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and put into his garden; and it grew, and became a tree; and the birds of the air lodged in its branches.' And again he said, 'Whereunto shall I liken the kingdom of God? It is like leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened.'

And he passed through the cities and villages, teaching, on his journey toward Jerusalem. Then said one unto him, 'Lord, are those that are saved few?' And he said unto them, 'Strive to enter through the narrow door: for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter, and will not be able. When once the master of the house hath risen up, and hath shut the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us; then he will answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are. Then will ye begin to say, We ate and drank in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets. But he will say, I tell you, I know you not whence ye are; depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity. There will be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves cast forth without. And they shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down to table in the kingdom of God. And, behold, there are last who shall be first, and there are first who shall be last.'

The same hour some of the Pharisees came to him, and said, 'Go forth and depart hence: for Herod wants to kill thee.' And he said unto them, 'Go ye, and tell this fox, Behold, I cast out demons and perform cures to-day and to-morrow, and on the third day I am perfected. Nevertheless I must journey to-day, and to-morrow, and the next day: for a prophet must not perish outside Jerusalem.

'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, who killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often have I desired to gather thy children together, as a hen gathereth her brood under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is deserted: I say unto you, Ye shall surely not see me until the time come when ye shall say, Blessed in the name of the Lord is he that cometh.'

CHAPTER XIV

And it came to pass, as he went into the house of one of the rulers of the Pharisees to eat bread on the sabbath day, that they watched him. And, behold, there was a man before him who had the dropsy. And Jesus spoke unto the teachers of the Law and unto the Pharisees, saying, 'Is it permitted to heal on the sabbath day or not?' But they held their peace. And he laid hold of the man, and healed him, and let him go. And he spoke to them, saying, 'Which of you if his ass or his ox fall into a well, will not straightway draw it out on the sabbath day?' And to these words they could find no answer.

And noticing how they chose out the chief seats, he spoke a parable to the guests, saying, 'When thou art invited by any one to a wedding, do not sit down in the chief seat, lest some one of higher rank than thou have been invited, and the host should come and say to thee, Give this man room; and thou shouldest then with shame have to take the last place. But when thou art invited, go and sit down in the last place, that when the host cometh, he may say unto thee, Friend, go up higher: then shalt thou have honour in the sight of all who sit at table with thee. For whoever exalteth himself shall be humbled; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.'

Then said he also to him that had invited him, 'When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, neither thy kinsmen, nor thy rich neighbours; lest they too invite thee in return, and thou hast thy recompence. But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: and thou shalt be happy; for they cannot recompense thee: but thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just.'

And hearing these words, one of those that sat at table with him said unto him, 'Happy is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God.'

Then said he unto him, 'A man prepared a great banquet, and invited many guests. And at the hour of the banquet he sent his servant to say to them that were invited, Come; for all is now ready. And they all with one accord began to excuse themselves. The first said unto him, I have bought a piece of land, and I must go and see it: I pray thee hold me excused. And another said, I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I am going to test them: I pray thee hold me excused. And another said, I have married a wife, and therefore I cannot come. So that servant came, and reported these words to his lord. Then the master of the house was angry, and said to his servant, Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor, and the maimed, and the blind, and the lame. And the servant said, Lord, what thou hast commanded hath been done, and there is still room. And the lord said unto the servant, Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled. For I say unto you that none of those men who were invited shall taste of my banquet.'

And great crowds journeyed with him: and he turned, and said unto them, 'If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brothers, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. And whoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple.

'For which of you, intending to build a tower, sitteth not down first, and reckoneth the cost, whether he have sufficient to finish it? Lest haply, having laid the foundation, and not being able to finish it, all that behold it begin to mock him, saying, This man began to build, and was not able to finish. Or what king, setting forth to make war against another king, sitteth not down first, and deliberateth whether he be able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand? And if not, while the other is yet far off, he sendeth an embassy, and asketh for conditions of peace. So then everyone of you that renounceth not all his possessions, he cannot be my disciple.

'Salt, then, is good: but if the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be seasoned? It is neither fit for the land, nor for the dunghill; men throw it away. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.'

CHAPTER XV

And all the tax-collectors and sinners came near to him to hear him. And the Pharisees and scribes murmured, saying, 'This man receives sinners, and eats with them.' And he spoke this parable unto them, saying, 'What man of you, having an hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the pasture, and go after the one which is lost, until he find it? And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulders, rejoicing. And when he hath come home, he calleth together his friends and neighbours, saying unto them, Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost. I say unto you, that in the same way there will be greater joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, than over ninety and nine just persons, who have no need of repentance.

'Or what woman having ten pieces of silver, if she lose one piece, doth not light a candle, and sweep the house, and search carefully until she find it? And when she hath found it, she calleth her friends and her neighbours together, saying, Rejoice with me; for I have found the piece which I lost. In like manner, I say unto you, is there joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.'

And he said, 'A man had two sons: and the younger of them said to his father, Father, give me the portion of the property that falls to me. And he divided unto them his possessions. And not many days after, the younger son collected together all that he had, and journeyed into a far country, and there wasted his property in riotous living. And when he had spent all, there arose a severe famine in that land; and he began to be in want. And he went and joined himself to a citizen of that country; and he sent him into his fields to feed the swine. And he would fain have filled his belly with the pods that the swine did eat: but no one gave him any. Then when he came to himself he said, How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish here with hunger! I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee, and am no longer worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants. And he arose, and came to his father. But while he was yet a long way off, his father saw him, and was moved with pity, and he ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight, and am no longer worthy to be called thy son. But the father said to his servants, Bring out quickly the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet: and bring the fatted calf, and kill it; and let us eat, and be merry: for this my son was dead, and has come to life again; he was lost, and has been found.

'And they began to be merry. Now his elder son was in the field: and as he came and drew nigh to the house, he heard musick and dancing. And he called one of the servants, and asked what these things meant. And he said unto him, Thy brother has come; and thy father has killed the fatted calf, because he has received him back safe and sound. And he was angry, and would not go in: so his father came out, and sought to appease him. And he answered and said to his father, Lo, these many years do I serve thee, and I have never transgressed a commandment of thine; and yet to me thou hast never given even a kid, that I might make merry with my friends. But when this son of thine has come, who has devoured thy property with harlots, thou hast killed for him the fatted calf. And he said unto him, Son, thou art always with me, and all that I have is thine. It was right that we should make merry and rejoice: for this thy brother was dead, and hath come to life again; he was lost, and has been found.'

CHAPTER XVI

And he said also unto his disciples, 'There was a rich man, who had a steward; and this steward was accused to him of wasting his property. And he called him, and said unto him, What is this that I hear of thee? give an account of thy stewardship; for thou canst not be steward any longer. Then the steward said within himself, What shall I do now that my lord taketh away from me the stewardship? I cannot dig; to beg I am ashamed. I know what I will do, that, when I am removed from the stewardship, they may receive me into their houses. So he called every one of his lord's debtors unto him, and said unto the first, How much owest thou unto my lord? And he said, An hundred measures of oil. And he said unto him, Here, take thy bond, and sit down quickly, and write fifty. Then said he to another, And how much owest thou? And he said, An hundred measures of wheat. And he said unto him, Here, take thy bond, and write eighty. And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had acted prudently; for the children of this world are more prudent towards their own generation than are the children of the light. And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when it fails, they may receive you into the everlasting tents.

'He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in that which is much: and he that is unjust in what is least is unjust also in what is much. If then ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will entrust you with the true? And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another's, who will give you that which is your own? No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will cleave to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.'

And the Pharisees, who love money, heard all these words; and they derided him. And he said unto them, 'Ye are they who justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is lofty among men is abomination before God. The Law and the Prophets were until John: since that time the tidings of the kingdom of God are being preached, and every man is forcing his way into it. But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of the Law to fail. Whoever divorceth his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whoever marrieth her that is divorced from her husband committeth adultery.

'There was a rich man, who was clothed in purple and fine linen, and lived joyously and sumptuously every day: and there was a beggar named Lazarus, who lay at his gate, and was full of sores. And he sought to satisfy his hunger with the bits which fell from the rich man's table: yea, even the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried. And he lifted up his eyes in hell, being in torments, and he saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am in anguish in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou didst receive thy good things in thy lifetime, and Lazarus similarly received evil things: now he is comforted here, and thou art in anguish. And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they who would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us that would come from thence. So he said, Then I pray thee, father, that thou send him to my father's house,—for I have five brothers,—so that he may testify unto them, that they may not come also into this place of torment. But Abraham said unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. And he said, Nay, father Abraham: but if someone went to them from the dead, they would repent. And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, they will not be persuaded, even though someone rose from the dead.'

CHAPTER XVII

And he said unto the disciples, 'It is impossible that stumbling-blocks should not come: but woe unto him, through whom they come! It would profit him more that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones.

'Take heed to yourselves. If thy brother have sinned, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. And if he sin against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him.'

And the apostles said unto the Lord, 'Increase our faith.' And the Lord said, 'If ye had faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye would say unto this mulberry tree, Be uprooted, and planted in the sea; and it would obey you.

'But which of you, having a servant ploughing or feeding cattle, will say unto him on his return from the field, Come and straightway sit down to table? Will he not rather say unto him, Get ready my supper, and gird thyself, and serve me, while I eat and drink; and afterwards thou canst eat and drink thyself? Doth he thank that servant because he did what he was ordered? So too ye, when ye have done all that which ye have been ordered to do, say, We are [useless] servants: we have merely done that which it was our duty to do.'

And it came to pass, as he journeyed to Jerusalem, that he passed between Samaria and Galilee. And as he entered into a certain village, there met him ten men that were lepers, who stood afar off, and lifted up their voices, and said, 'Jesus, Master, have pity upon us.' And when he saw them, he said unto them, 'Go show yourselves unto the priests.' And it came to pass, that, as they went, they were cleansed. And one of them, when he saw that he was healed, turned back, and with a loud voice glorified God. And he fell down on his face at his feet, giving him thanks. Now he was a Samaritan. And Jesus said, 'Were not the ten cleansed? where are the nine? Were none found to return and give glory to God except this foreigner?' And he said unto him, 'Arise, go thy way: thy faith hath saved thee.'

And being questioned by the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God would come, he answered them and said, 'The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is among you.'

And he said unto the disciples, 'The days will come, when ye will desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see it. And they shall say to you, Lo there, lo here: go not after them, nor follow them. For as the lightning flashing from one side under the heaven, shineth unto the other side, so shall the Son of man be in his day. But first he must suffer much, and be rejected by this generation. And as it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. They kept on eating, drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all. Likewise as it was in the days of Lot; they kept on eating, drinking, buying, selling, planting and building; but on the day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be on the day when the Son of man is revealed. In that day, he who shall be upon the roof, and his goods in the house, let him not come down to take them away: and so too let not him that is in the field, turn back. Remember Lot's wife. Whoever seeketh to save his life shall lose it; and whoever shall lose his life shall preserve it. I tell you, in that night there shall be two men in one bed; the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left. Two women shall be grinding at the same mill; the one shall be taken, and the other left.' And they answered and said unto him, 'Where, Lord?' And he said unto them, 'Where the corpse is, there too will the vultures be gathered together.'

CHAPTER XVIII

And he spoke a parable unto them to show that they ought always to pray, and not to lose heart: 'There was in a certain city a judge, who neither feared God, nor regarded man: and there was a widow in that city; and she came unto him, saying, Avenge me upon mine adversary. And for a time he would not do so; but afterwards he said to himself, Even though I fear not God, nor regard man; yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest at last she should come and hit me in the face.' And the Lord said, 'Hear what the unjust judge saith. And shall not God avenge his own elect, who cry day and night unto him, while he is longsuffering to their enemies? I tell you that he will avenge them speedily.

'Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, will he find faith on the earth?'

And he spoke this parable in respect of some who were self confident that they were righteous, and despised others: 'Two men went up into the temple to pray; the one a Pharisee, and the other a tax-collector. The Pharisee stood and prayed by himself thus: God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or also like this tax-collector. I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess. But the tax-collector stood at a distance, and would not even lift up his eyes unto heaven, but kept smiting his breast, saying, God be gracious to me the sinner. I tell you, this man went down to his house justified rather than the other: for every one that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that abaseth himself shall be exalted.'

And they brought unto him also some infants, so that he might touch them: but when his disciples saw it, they rebuked them.

But Jesus called the infants unto him, and said, 'Let the little children come unto me, and prevent them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, shall surely not enter therein.'

And a certain ruler asked him, saying, 'Good Master, what must I do to inherit eternal life?' And Jesus said unto him, 'Why callest thou me good? none is good, except God alone. Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not murder, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother.' And he said, 'All these have I observed from my youth up.' And Jesus heard, and said unto him, 'Yet one thing thou lackest: sell all that thou hast, and distribute it unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me.' And when he heard that, he was very sorrowful: for he was very rich.

And when Jesus saw him, he said, 'How hard it is for them that have riches to enter into the kingdom of God! For it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God.' And they that heard him said, 'Who then can be saved?' And he said, 'What is impossible for men is possible for God.' Then Peter said, 'Lo, *we* have abandoned our possessions and followed thee.' And he said unto them, 'Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath abandoned house, or wife, or brothers, or parents, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive back many times more in this age, and in the world to come life everlasting.'

Then he took the Twelve aside, and said unto them, 'Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all that hath been written by the prophets about the Son of man shall be accomplished. For he will be given up to the heathen, and will be mocked, and ill treated, and spat upon; and they will scourge him, and put him to death: and on the third day he will rise again.' And they understood none of these words; and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they what was said.

And it came to pass, that as he drew near to Jericho, a blind man sat by the way side begging: and hearing a crowd passing by, he asked what this might be. And they told him that Jesus of Nazareth was coming by. And he cried out, saying, 'Jesus, son of David, have pity upon me.' And they who were in front rebuked him, that he should hold his peace: but he kept on crying all the louder, 'Son of David, have pity upon me.' And Jesus stood still, and commanded him to be brought unto him: and when he had come near, he asked him, 'What wouldst thou that I should do unto thee?' And he said, 'Lord, I would that I might see again.' And Jesus said unto him, 'See again: thy faith hath saved thee.' And immediately he saw again, and he followed him, glorifying God: and all the people, when they saw it, gave praise unto God.

CHAPTER XIX

And Jesus entered and passed through Jericho. And, behold, there was a man named Zacchæus, who was the chief tax-collector and rich. And he sought to see who Jesus was; and he could not because of the crowd, for he was little of stature. And he ran in front, and climbed up on to a sycomore tree to see him: for he was about to pass that way. And when Jesus came to the place, he looked up, and saw him, and said unto him, 'Zacchæus, make haste to come down; for to-day I must stay at thy house.' And he made haste to come down, and received him joyfully. And when they saw it, they all murmured, saying, 'He has gone in to lodge with a sinner.' And Zacchæus stood, and said unto the Lord; 'Behold, Lord, the half of my possessions I give to the poor; and if I have wrongfully exacted ought from any man, I restore it to him fourfold.' And Jesus said unto him, 'This day hath salvation come to this house, seeing that he also is a son of Abraham. For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.'

And as they hearkened to these words, he went on and spoke a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the kingdom of God would appear at once. So he said: 'A certain noble journeyed to a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and then to return. And he called his ten servants, and gave to them ten pounds, and said unto them, Trade therewith till I return. But his fellow citizens hated him, and sent an embassy after him, saying, We do not wish this man to reign over us. And it came to pass, that when he had returned, having received the kingdom, he bade those servants to be called unto him, to whom he had given the money, that he might know how much each man had gained by trading. Then came the first, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained ten pounds more. And he said unto him, Excellent, thou good servant: because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities. And the second came, saying, Lord, thy pound hath made five pounds. And he said likewise to him, Be thou also over five cities. And another came, saying, Lord, behold thy pound, which I have kept laid away in a napkin: for I feared thee, because thou art an hard man: thou takest what thou hast not deposited, and reapest what thou hast not sown. And he said unto him, Out of thine own mouth I condemn thee, thou wicked servant. Thou knewest that I was an hard man, taking what I have not deposited, and reaping what I have not sown: why then didst thou not put my money into the bank, that at my return I might have got it back with interest? And he said unto them that stood by, Take away from him the pound, and give it to him that hath the ten pounds. (And they said unto him, He has ten pounds already.) For I say unto you, Unto every one who hath shall be given; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath. But as for those mine enemies, who did not wish me to reign over them, bring them hither, and slay them before me.'

And when he had thus spoken, he journeyed forward, on his way up to Jerusalem. And it came to pass, when he had come nigh to Bethphage and Bethany, at the so-called mount of Olives, he sent two of his disciples, saying, 'Go to the village before you; in which as ye enter it ye will find an ass's colt tied, whereon no man has yet sat: loose it, and bring it hither. And if any man ask you, Why do ye loose it? thus shall ye say, The Lord has need of it.'

And they that were sent went their way, and found even as he had said unto them. And as they were loosing the colt, its owners said unto them, 'Why loose ye the colt?' And they said, 'The Lord has need of it.'

And they brought it to Jesus: and they threw their garments upon the colt, and they mounted Jesus upon it. And as he went, they spread their clothes upon the way. And when he had come near to the descent of the mount of Olives, the whole band of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the miracles that they had seen, saying, 'Blessed in the name of the Lord be the king that cometh: peace in heaven, and glory in the heights.'

And some of the Pharisees from among the crowd said unto him, 'Master, rebuke thy disciples.' And he answered and said unto them, 'I tell you that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would cry out.'

And as he came near, he beheld the city, and wept over it, saying, 'If thou too, yea even on this thy day, hadst known what would lead to thy peace—but now it hath been hid from thine eyes. For days will come upon thee, when thine enemies will throw up an entrenchment against thee, and surround thee, and hem thee in on every side, and they will raze thee to the ground, and thy children within thee; and they will not leave in thee one stone upon another; because they knewest not the time of thy visitation.'

And he went into the temple, and began to drive out them that sold therein, saying unto them, 'It is written, My house shall be a house of prayer: but ye have made it a den of thieves.'

And he taught daily in the temple. But the chief priests and the scribes and the chiefs of the people sought to destroy him. And they could not find out what they should do: for the people all hung upon his lips.

CHAPTER XX

And it came to pass one day as he was teaching the people in the temple, and proclaiming the good tidings, that the chief priests and the scribes came up to him with the Elders, and spoke unto him, saying, 'Tell us, by what authority doest thou these things? or who is it that gave thee this authority?' And he answered and said unto them, 'I will also ask you one question; and answer me: the baptism of John, was it from heaven, or from men?' And they reasoned with themselves, saying, 'If we say, From heaven; he will say, Why then did ye not believe him? but if we say, From men; all the people will stone us: for they are convinced that John was a prophet.' And they answered that they knew not whence it was. And Jesus said unto them, 'Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things.'

Then began he to speak to the people this parable; 'A man planted a vineyard, and let it to husbandmen, and went abroad for some time. And at the due season he sent a servant to the husbandmen, that they should give him of the fruit of the vineyard: but the husbandmen beat him, and sent him away empty. And again he sent another servant: and they beat him also, and abused him, and sent him away empty. And again he sent a third: and they wounded him also, and cast him out. Then said the lord of the vineyard, What shall I do? I will send my beloved son: perhaps they will have respect for him. But when the husbandmen saw him, they considered among themselves, saying, This is the heir: come, let us kill him, that the inheritance may be ours. So they cast him out of the vineyard, and killed him. What, then, will the lord of the vineyard do unto them? He will come and destroy these husbandmen, and give the vineyard to others.'

And when they heard it, they said, 'God forbid.' And he looked at them, and said, 'What, then, is this which is written, The stone which the builders rejected is become the corner stone? Whoever shall fall upon that stone shall be broken in pieces; and on whomsoever it shall fall, it will crush him to dust.'

And the chief priests and the scribes sought that very hour to lay hands on him; but they feared the people: for they realised that he had spoken this parable against them.

So they watched, and sent forth spies, who feigned to be righteous men, that they might catch him by a word, so as to give him up to the rule and authority of the governor. And they asked him, saying, 'Master, we know that thou sayest and teachest straightforwardly, neither dost thou respect the person of anyone, but thou teachest the way of God truly: Is it lawful for us to give tribute unto the Emperor, or no?' But he perceived their craftiness, and said unto them, 'Why tempt ye me? Shew me a silver coin. Whose image and superscription has it?' They answered and said, 'The Emperor's.' And he said unto them, 'Pay then to the Emperor what is the Emperor's and to God what is God's.' And they could not catch him by a word before the people: and they marvelled at his answer, and held their peace.

Then came to him some of the Sadducees, who deny that there is a resurrection; and they asked him, saying, 'Master, Moses wrote for us, If a man die, having a wife, but no child, his brother must marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. Now there were seven brothers: and the first took a wife, and died without children. And the second and the third took her to wife, and so too all the seven: and they left no children, and died. Last of all the woman died also. So in the resurrection whose wife of them is she? for the seven had her to wife.'

And Jesus answered and said unto them, 'The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage: but they who have been accounted worthy to obtain *that* world and the resurrection of the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage. For they cannot die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the sons of God, being the sons of the resurrection. Now that the dead are raised, Moses also hath indicated in the story of the

Bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob. But he is not a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him.' Then some of the scribes answered and said, 'Master, thou hast spoken excellently.' For they no longer dared to ask him any other question.

And he said unto them, 'How say they that the Messiah is David's son? And David himself saith in the book of Psalms, The LORD said unto my lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool. So David calleth him lord, how is he then his son?'

Then in the hearing of all the people he said unto his disciples, 'Beware of the scribes, who like to walk in long robes, and love salutations in the market-places, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and the chief places at feasts; who devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: these shall receive all the heavier punishment.'

CHAPTER XXI

And he looked up, and saw some rich men throwing their gifts into the treasury. And he saw also a certain poor widow throwing in thither two farthings. And he said, 'Of a truth I say unto you, that this poor widow hath thrown in more than they all: for all these threw in from their superfluity unto the offerings: but she from her poverty hath thrown in all the living that she had.'

And as some spoke of the temple, how it was adorned with beautiful stones and gifts, he said, 'As for these things which ye behold, days will come, in which there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.'

And they asked him, saying, 'Master, when, then, shall these things be? and what is the sign when these things are about to be fulfilled?' And he said, 'Take heed that ye be not led astray: for many will come in my name, saying, It is I, and the time hath drawn near: go ye not after them. But when ye shall hear of wars and tumults, be not terrified: for these things must first happen, but the End is not at once.'

Then said he unto them, 'Nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there will be great earthquakes and famines, and pestilences in divers places; and fearful sights and great signs will there be from heaven. But before all these, they will lay their hands on you, and persecute you, giving you up to the synagogues and prisons, and bringing you before kings and rulers for my name's sake. And it will be to you an opportunity for bearing witness. So resolve in your hearts not to practise beforehand what ye shall answer: for I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to withstand or gainsay. And ye will be given up even by parents, and brothers, and kinsfolk, and friends; and some of you they will put to death. And ye will be hated of all men for my name's sake. But not an hair of your head shall perish. Through your endurance ye shall acquire your lives.

'But when ye see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them who are in Judæa flee to the mountains; and let them who are in the midst of the city go forth; and let them that are in the country enter not in. For these are days of vengeance, that all which hath been written may be fulfilled. But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days; for there will be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people. And they will fall by the edge of the sword, and be led away captive unto all the nations: and Jerusalem will be trodden down by the nations, until the times of the nations be fulfilled.

'And there will be signs in the sun and the moon and the stars; and upon the earth panic of nations in their perplexity at the roaring of the sea and the tossing of its waves; men dying from fear and anxious expectation of the things which are coming upon the earth: for the heavenly powers will be shaken. And then they will see the Son of man coming on a cloud with power and great glory. And when these things begin to come to pass, then take heart and raise your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh.'

And he spoke to them a parable; 'Behold the fig tree, and all the trees. When they shoot forth, ye see and know of yourselves that summer is now near. So too, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is near.

'Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away till all shall have taken place. Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away.

'And take heed to yourselves, that your hearts be not made heavy by debauchery and drunkenness, and worldly cares, and that day come not upon you suddenly as a snare. For come it will upon all that dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch then and pray always, that ye may have power to escape all these things that are about to come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man.'

And in the day time he used to teach in the temple; and at night he went out, and abode in the mount that is called the mount of Olives. And all the people came early in the morning to him in the temple to listen to him.

CHAPTER XXII

Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the Passover. And the chief priests and scribes sought how they might kill him; for they feared the people.

And Satan entered into Judas who was called Iscariot, and was of the number of the Twelve. And he went, and conferred with the chief priests and officers as to how he might deliver him up unto them. And they were glad, and agreed to give him money. And he promised, and kept seeking an opportunity to deliver him up unto them, when the crowd should be absent.

Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover had to be killed. And he sent Peter and John, saying, 'Go and prepare for us the passover, that we may eat it.' And they said unto him, 'Where wouldst thou that we prepare it?' And he said unto them, 'Behold, when ye have entered into the city, a man will meet you, bearing a pitcher of water; follow him into the house in which he entereth. And ye shall say unto the owner of the house, The Master saith unto thee, Where is the chamber, where I may eat the passover with my disciples?' And he will show you a large upper room furnished with couches; there prepare it.' And they departed, and found as he had said unto them: and they prepared the passover.

And when the hour had come, he sat down to table, and the twelve apostles with him. And he said unto them, 'I have earnestly desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I shall surely not eat it again until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.'

And he took a cup, and spoke the blessing, and said, 'Take this, and divide it among yourselves: for I say unto you, From henceforth I shall surely not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall have come.'

And he took bread, and spoke the blessing, and broke it, and gave it unto them, saying, 'This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me.' Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood, which is shed for you.

'But, behold, the hand of him that is betraying me is with me on the table. For the Son of man indeed goeth, as it hath been determined: but woe unto that man through whom he is betrayed!' And they began to argue among themselves, which of them it might be who was about to do this.

And a contention arose among them, which of them should be accounted as greatest. And he said unto them, 'The kings of the nations lord it over them; and they that exercise authority over them are called benefactors. But with you it shall not be so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the youngest; and the leader as the servant. For which is greater, he that sitteth at table, or he that serveth? is not he that sitteth at table? but I am among you as one that serveth. Yet ye are they who have stood fast with me in my temptations. And I appoint to you, even as my Father appointed dominion unto me, that ye are to eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and to sit on thrones ruling the twelve tribes of Israel.

'Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath demanded to sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not. And when thou hast repented, strengthen thy brethren.' And he said unto him, 'Lord, I am ready to go with thee, both unto prison and unto death.' And he said, 'I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow to-day, until thou shalt have thrice denied that thou knowest me.'

And he said unto them, 'When I sent you forth without purse and wallet and shoes, lacked ye any thing?' And they said, 'Nothing.' Then said he unto them, 'But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his wallet; and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one. For I say unto you, that this word which is written must be fulfilled in me: *and he was reckoned among the transgressors:* for that which concerneth me hath now an end.' And they said, 'Lord, behold, here are two swords.' And he said unto them, 'It is enough.'

And he came out, and went, as he was wont, to the mount of Olives; and his disciples also followed him. And when he arrived at the place, he said unto them, 'Pray that ye come not into temptation.' And he withdrew from them about a stone's throw, and he knelt down, and prayed, saying, 'Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done.'

And an angel from heaven appeared unto him, strengthening him. And in an agony of fear he prayed still more earnestly: and his sweat became like great drops of blood falling upon the ground.

And when he rose up from prayer, and came to his disciples, he found them sleeping for sorrow. And he said unto them, 'Why sleep ye? arise and pray, that ye come not into temptation.'

And while he yet spoke, behold a crowd, and the man called Judas, one of the Twelve, at their head, and he came near unto Jesus to kiss him. But Jesus said unto him, 'Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?' And when his companions saw what was coming, they said unto him, 'Lord, shall we smite with the sword?' And one of them smote the servant of the high priest, and cut off his right ear. And Jesus answered and said, 'Let this suffice.' And he touched his ear, and healed him.

Then Jesus said unto the chief priests and the generals of the temple and the elders, who had come up to him, 'Have ye come out, as against a thief, with swords and clubs? When I was daily with you in the temple, ye stretched out no hands against me: but this is your hour, and the power of darkness.'

Then they seized him, and led him away, and brought him into the high priest's house. And Peter followed at a distance.

And they kindled a fire in the middle of the court, and sat down together, and Peter sat down among them. But one of the maids saw him as he sat by the fire, and she gazed upon him, and said, 'This man also was with him.' And he denied it, saying, 'Woman, I know him not.' And after a little while somebody else saw him, and said, 'Thou also art one of them.' And Peter said, 'Man, I am not.' And about the space of one hour after, another confidently asserted, saying, 'Of a truth this fellow also was with him: for he is a Galilæan.' And Peter said, 'Man, I know not what thou sayest.' And immediately, while he yet spoke, the cock crew. And the Lord turned, and looked at Peter. And Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how he had said unto him, 'Before the cock crow to-day, thou wilt deny me thrice.' And he went out, and wept bitterly.

And the men that held Jesus fast mocked him and beat him. And they blindfolded him, and asked him, saying, 'Prophesy, who is it that struck thee?' And many other words they said, reviling him.

And as soon as it was day, the elders of the people and the chief priests and the scribes came together, and they led him away to their council chamber, and said, 'If thou art the Messiah, tell us.' And he said unto them, 'If I tell you, ye will not believe: and if I ask, ye will not answer. But from now the Son of man will sit on the right hand of the power of God.' Then said they all, 'Art thou, then, the Son of God?' And he said unto them, 'Ye say that I am.' And they said, 'What further need have we of witness? for we ourselves have heard from his own mouth.'

CHAPTER XXIII

And the whole number of them arose, and led him unto Pilate. And they began to accuse him, saying, 'We have found this man perverting our nation, forbidding to give tribute to the Emperor, and saying that he himself is Messiah, a King.' And Pilate asked him, saying, 'Art thou the King of the Jews?' And he answered him and said, 'Thou sayest it.' Then said Pilate to the chief priests and to the people, 'I find no guilt in this man.' But they became the more persistent, saying, 'He stirs up the people, teaching through all Judæa, beginning from Galilee, unto here.'

When Pilate heard that, he asked whether the man were a Galilæan. And when he learnt that he belonged unto the dominion of Herod, he sent him to Herod, who himself also was at Jerusalem at that time. And when Herod saw Jesus, he was exceeding glad: for he had for a long time wanted to see him, because he had heard of him; and he hoped to see some sign performed by him. Then he questioned him with many words; but he answered him nothing.

And the chief priests and scribes stood by, and vehemently accused him. And Herod with his soldiers despised him, and mocked him, and having arrayed him in fine apparel, he sent him back to Pilate. And on that day Pilate and Herod became friends with one another; for before they were at enmity.

Then Pilate summoned the chief priests and the rulers and the people, and said unto them, 'Ye have brought this man unto me, as one that perverts the people: and, behold, I, having examined him before you, have found no guilt in this man touching those things whereof ye accuse him: no, nor yet Herod: for he sent him back to us; and, lo, nothing worthy of death has been done by him. I will scourge him, therefore, and release him.'

But they cried out all together, saying, 'Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas: (who on account of a certain riot which had happened in the city, and also on account of a murder, had been cast into prison. For Pilate was compelled to release one man to them at the festival.) Then Pilate, wishing to release Jesus, spoke again to them. But they kept crying out, saying, 'Crucify him, crucify him.' And he said unto them the third time, 'Why, what evil has this man done? I have found nothing worthy of death in him: I will therefore scourge him, and release him.' But they pressed insistently, demanding with loud voices that he should be crucified. And their voices prevailed. And Pilate gave sentence that their demand should be carried out. And he released unto them him that on account of riot and murder had been cast into prison, whom they asked for; but he delivered up Jesus to their will.

And as they led him away, they laid hold of one Simon of Cyrene who was passing by from the country, and on him they laid the cross, to carry it after Jesus. And there followed him a great number of people, and also of women, who beat their breasts and lamented him. But Jesus turned unto them and said, 'Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children. For, behold, the days are coming, in which they will say, Happy are the barren, and the wombs that never bore, and the breasts which never gave suck. Then will they begin to say to the mountains, Fall on us; and to the hills, Cover us. For if they do these things to the green tree, what will be done to the dry?'

And two others, criminals, were also led along with him to be put to death. And when they came to the place which is called the Skull, there they crucified him, and the criminals, one on his right hand, and the other on the left. Then said Jesus, 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.'

And they divided his garments, and cast lots. And the people stood and looked on. And the rulers scoffed, saying, 'He saved others; let him save himself, if this is the Messiah of God, the chosen one.' And the soldiers also mocked him, coming up to him, and offering him vinegar, and saying, 'If thou art the king of the Jews, save thyself.' And an inscription also was over him: 'This is the king of the Jews.'

And one of the criminals who had been hung up reviled him, saying, 'Art not thou the Messiah? save thyself and us.' But the other rebuked him, saying, 'Dost thou not even fear God, seeing thou art suffering the same condemnation? And we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man has done nothing wrong.' And he said unto Jesus, 'Lord, remember me when thou comest with thy kingdom.' And Jesus said unto him, 'Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.'

And it was already about the sixth hour, and there was a darkness over all the land until the ninth hour, for the sun was in eclipse; and the curtain of the temple was rent down the middle. And Jesus cried out with a loud voice, and said, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit': and having said this, he expired.

Now when the centurion saw what had happened, he glorified God, saying, 'Assuredly this man was innocent.' And all the crowds who had come together for this spectacle, when they beheld what happened, smote their breasts, and returned. And all his acquaintance, and the women who had followed him from Galilee, stood at a distance afar off, looking upon these things.

And, behold, there was a man named Joseph, a councillor; and he was a good and just man, and he had not agreed with their resolve and deed. He was from Arimathæa, a city of the Jews, and was himself waiting for the kingdom of God. This man went to Pilate, and asked for the body of Jesus. And he took it down, and wrapped it in fine linen, and laid it in a sepulchre which was hewn out of stone, wherein no man was laid before. And it was the day of preparation, and the sabbath was beginning. And the women also, who had come with him from Galilee, followed after, and they looked at the sepulchre, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and they rested on the sabbath day according to the commandment.

CHAPTER XXIV

Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre. But having entered in, they found not the body of the Lord Jesus. And it came to pass, while they were perplexed about this, behold, two men stood by them in shining raiment. And when they were afraid, and bent down their faces to the ground, they said unto them, 'Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spoke unto you while he was yet in Galilee, saying that the Son of man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again.' And they remembered his words, and they returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest. (It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and the other women that were with them, who told these things to the apostles.) And these words seemed to them as idle talk, and they believed them not.

And, behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was sixty furlongs from Jerusalem. And they talked together about all these events. And it came to pass, that, while they talked together and argued, Jesus himself came near, and walked with them. But their eyes were held fast, so that they did not know him.

And he said unto them, 'What are these discussions which ye are holding with one another, as ye walk?' And they stood still, looking sad. And one of them, whose name was Cleopas, answered and said unto him, 'Art thou the only pilgrim in Jerusalem, who does not know the things which have happened therein during these days?' And he said unto them, 'What things?' And they said unto him, 'About Jesus of Nazareth, who was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people: and how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him up to be condemned to death, and crucified him. But we hoped that it was he who was to redeem Israel. And, moreover, besides all this, it is now the third day since these things took place. Yet certain women of our company have amazed us, for they went at dawn to the sepulchre, and did not find his body, and came to us, saying, that they had also seen a vision of angels, who said that he was alive. And some of our number went to the sepulchre, and found it even so as the women had said: but him they did not see.'

Then he said unto them, 'O senseless, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: had not the Messiah to suffer these things, and so to enter into his glory?' And beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them what is said in all the scriptures about himself. And they drew nigh unto the village, whither they were going; and he made as though he was going on further. But they pressed him, saying, 'Remain with us: for it is toward evening, and the day is already far spent.' And he went in to stay with them. And it came to pass, as he sat at table with them, he took bread, and spoke the blessing, and broke it and gave it to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight.

And they said one to another, 'Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the scriptures?' And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them, who said to them, 'The Lord has verily risen and has appeared to Simon.' Then they, in their turn, told what had happened on the way, and how he became known to them in the breaking of the bread.

And as they thus spoke, he himself stood in the midst of them, [and said unto them, 'Peace be unto you.'] But they were scared and frightened, and supposed that they saw a spirit. And he said unto them, 'Why are ye agitated? and why do doubts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: touch me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see that I have.' [And when he had said this, he showed them his hands and his feet.] And while they yet disbelieved for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, 'Have ye any food here?' And they gave him a piece of broiled fish. And he took it, and ate it before them.

And he said unto them, 'These are the words which I spoke unto you, while I was yet with you, that all must be fulfilled, which is written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me.' Then opened he their mind to understand the scriptures. And he said unto them, 'Thus it is written that the Messiah should suffer, and that he should rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance for forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name unto all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things. And, behold, I send out the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high.'

And he led them out as far as to Bethany, and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass, as he blessed them, he was parted from them. And they returned to Jerusalem with great joy, and were continually in the temple, praising God.

LUKE

CHAPTER I

1–4. THE PROLOGUE

(Luke only)

1 Forasmuch as many have undertaken to draw up a narrative
2 of those things which have been accomplished among us, even as
they who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of
3 the Word delivered them unto us, it seemed good to me also, after
I had accurately gone through all the facts from their origin, to
write them down for thee in their order, most noble Theophilus,
4 that thou mayest realize the sure certainty of the teachings
wherein thou hast been instructed.

Luke, unlike Mark and Matthew, starts with a preface, written in rather elaborate Greek. The author clearly announces himself to be a compiler. He is not an eye-witness; he draws upon oral tradition and written narratives. Yet he 'claims for his narrative certain special merits. He has prepared himself by careful study to make it complete in its scope, exact in its details, and faithful in its arrangement' (Carpenter, *First Three Gospels*, p. 233). We may, perhaps, infer that there already existed when he wrote a number of written Gospels. But from the great use he has made of it, Luke must have considered that Mark was, on the whole, the most trustworthy of these records.

1. 'Accomplished,' or 'fulfilled.' The meaning, however, is probably not more than 'brought to completion.'
'Among us,' *i.e.* us Christians.

2. 'Eye-witnesses.' The tradition started from the contemporaries of Jesus. Through how many intervening stages it had

passed we are not told. ‘From the beginning’; this apparently means from the baptism.

‘Ministers (or, servants) of the Word,’ *i.e.* of the spoken Gospel. The genitive only goes with ‘ministers,’ not with ‘eye-witnesses.’ Thus we see that Luke’s sources are not regarded by him as the products of eye-witnesses. They, like himself, gathered, whether directly or indirectly, what the contemporaries of Jesus had said. These sources include Mark and other writings (*e.g.* Q), now lost. It is disputed whether Luke knew Matthew, or any earlier redaction of Matthew. If he did, he did not regard it as the work of the apostle.

3. ‘After I had accurately gone through all the facts from their origin,’ or ‘having traced the course of all things accurately from the first.’ His work will be full (this is implied in ‘all’). It will also be accurate. It will also relate the facts ‘from their origin’ or ‘from the first’ (ἄνωθεν), that is, not from the baptism, but from the birth. This interpretation supposes that the author of the main portion of the Gospel was also the author or compiler or editor of chapters i. and ii. It is, however, possible, as Usener and others think, that these chapters were added later, and that ἄνωθεν means no more than ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς ‘from the beginning’ *i.e.* from the baptism.

‘To write [them] down for thee in [their] order.’ His arrangement is also to be excellent. As a matter of fact he mainly follows Mark, and when he deviates from Mark, he seems to go wrong. But right order to the Evangelist may have meant a right logical order, or one in which each event and saying is given its suitable place. (*Cp. E. S.* I. p. 273.)

4. ‘That thou mayest realize (or, know) the sure certainty (or, ground) of the teachings wherein thou hast been instructed.’ The Gospel traditions form the substance of regular oral teaching. The ‘sure ground’ means the historic basis of that teaching. The λόγοι are the details of the λόγος. Who Theophilus was is unknown. The adjective κράτιστος implies that he was in a high station.

5–25. THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE BIRTH OF JOHN THE BAPTIST

(Luke only)

5 There was in the days of Herod, the king of Judæa, a certain priest named Zacharias, of the class of Abijah: and his wife was
6 of the daughters of Aaron, and her name was Elisabeth. And

they were both righteous before God, walking in all the command-
7 ments and ordinances of the Lord blameless. And they had no
child, because Elisabeth was barren, and they both were far
advanced in years.

8 And it came to pass, that while he was discharging his office
of priest before God in the order of his class, the lot fell upon
9 him, according to the custom of the priestly service, to go into
10 the temple of the Lord and to burn the incense. And the whole
multitude of the people were praying without at the hour of the
11 incense. And there appeared unto him an angel of the Lord
12 standing on the right side of the altar of incense. And when
Zacharias saw him, he was greatly agitated, and fear fell upon
13 him. But the angel said unto him, 'Fear not, Zacharias: for thy
prayer hath been heard; and thy wife Elisabeth shall bear thee a
14 son, and thou shalt call his name John. And thou shalt have joy
15 and gladness; and many shall rejoice at his birth. For he shall
be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor
strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Spirit, even
16 from his mother's womb. And many of the children of Israel shall
17 he turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before Him in
the spirit and power of Elijah, to turn the hearts of the fathers to
the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the righteous:
18 to make ready for the Lord a prepared people.' And Zacharias
said unto the angel, 'Whereby shall I know this? for I am an old
19 man, and my wife well advanced in years.' And the angel answered
and said unto him, 'I am Gabriel, that stand before God; and I
have been sent to speak unto thee, and to tell thee these good
20 tidings. And, behold, thou shalt be dumb, and not able to speak,
until the day that these things shall happen, because thou didst
not believe my words, which shall be fulfilled in their season.'

21 And the people were waiting for Zacharias, and wondered that
22 he tarried so long in the temple. And when he came out, he
could not speak unto them: and they realized that he had seen
a vision in the temple: and he himself kept making signs unto
23 them, and he remained dumb. And it came to pass, that, as soon
as the days of his service were completed, he departed to his own
24 home. And after those days his wife Elisabeth conceived, and
25 hid herself five months, saying, 'Thus hath the Lord done unto

me in the days wherein he looked on me, to take away my reproach among men.'

For the stories, or rather legends, in chapters i. and ii. Luke probably used a special Jewish-Christian source. The narrative is not only coloured by endless Old Testament reminiscences, and built up out of Old Testament material, but it reflects Jewish sentiment, feeling and ideals. The source was perhaps written in Aramaic or Hebrew, though Loisy thinks in Greek. On the other hand Harnack thinks it quite possible that Luke had no written source at all. He consciously and laboriously imitated—especially in the songs—the language of the Septuagint, and yet mixed up with this language are the elements and vocabulary of his own style. On the other hand B. Weiss holds that chapters i. and ii. were taken by Luke from the special source L, which with Q and Mark constitute practically the whole of Luke's authorities. B. Weiss's views (*Quellen*, A, pp. 197–200) as to the historical character of the stories in these two chapters are really, at this time of day, a curiosity in exegesis and criticism. Harnack in his lengthy, and on the whole favourable, review of Weiss's two books (*Quellen*, A and B) in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (1908, p. 466) says not unreasonably: 'Ich bin weit von jenen Kritikern entfernt, die, wenn sie auf eine Wundererzählung stossen, sofort eine Respektsdistanz von einigen Jahrzehnten einfügen, um sich von dem Schreck zu erholen, aber das Weiss die Bilder in K. I und II mit ihren zahlreichen religionsgeschichtlichen Parallelen für *ursprüngliche* naive und geschichtlich zutreffende Erzählungen halten kann ist für mich ein Wunder, das ich durch keine Respektsdistanz zu erklären vermag.'

Very large space is given to the birth of John. It seems disproportionate. Hence there is something to be said for the idea that the story of John the Baptist's birth existed independently and was of Jewish origin. It was then taken over and edited by the compiler of chapters i. and ii. The great bulk of it is very Jewish in character and form, and it is built up upon Old Testament models and reminiscences.

5. Herod died 4 B.C.

The 'class' or 'course' of Abijah. See I Chr. xxiv. 10. There were twenty-four divisions of the Priesthood, who took it in turn to perform the sacrificial duties in the Temple. Each division acted for a week. The word *ἐφημερία* is inexact, as it would imply that the service of each division or 'class' only lasted one day.

Elisabeth was the name of the wife of Aaron, Exodus vi. 23. It means: 'God is [my] oath.' One cannot say whether the name is historical, *i.e.* whether John's mother was really called Elisabeth.

6. A Jewish description of piety and goodness.

7. Abraham and Sarah are models for the story (Genesis xviii. 11) as well as Hannah and Elkanah.

9. The special duties which had to be performed in the Temple, and among them the office of burning incense, were allocated to the priests of each division by lot. Apparently no priest went into the sanctuary alone to perform this duty. Others went with him. But a story such as that before us need not be concerned with a detail of that kind.

11. Old Testament reminiscences abound. *Cp.* Judges xiii.

13. *Cp.* Daniel x. 12. It had not been said that Zacharias had prayed. Had he prayed for a child? But he could not have done that according to 18. The narrative is here, therefore, somewhat deficient. John (Jochanan) means 'God is gracious.'

15. *Cp.* Judges xiii. 4, 7, 14; Jer. i. 5. From his earliest age he shall be filled with God's spirit.

17. The words are based upon Malachi. In all that is said by the angel there is nothing definitely Christian; that is to say, it is quite conceivable that the legend grew up among the disciples of John, and was then adopted by a Christian writer.

'Go before Him,' *i.e.* before God. καὶ ἀπειθεῖς, 'and the disobedient to (walk in) the wisdom of the righteous.' The 'rebellious' and the 'sons' are identified; the 'fathers' and the 'just.' That is to say, John will bring the present rebellious generation into religious harmony with the righteous of olden time. He will do this by making the 'sons' penitent. Thus he forms a people ready for the kingdom of God. The quotation seems to be taken from the Hebrew direct and not from the Septuagint.

18. *Cp.* the Old Testament models, Genesis xv. 8, xvii. 17, xviii. 12.

20. For the dumbness *cp.* Daniel x. 15–17.

24. Elisabeth conceals herself through a certain feeling of shame that she, the elderly woman, has become pregnant; nevertheless she recognizes that the fact takes away a deeper shame, namely, that of childlessness, according to Oriental and Jewish conceptions. *Cp.* Genesis xxx. 23. Perhaps, however, her concealment and silence are due, as Loisy says, rather to the needs of

the story. None must know that the word of the angel has been realized; only Mary is to hear of it through the angel Gabriel.

26–38. Prediction of the Birth of Jesus

(Luke only)

26 And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God
27 unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, to a virgin betrothed to
a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the
28 virgin's name was Mary. And the angel came in unto her, and
29 said, 'Hail, thou favoured one, the Lord be with thee.' But she
was agitated at his word, and pondered as to what this greeting
30 might denote. And the angel said unto her, 'Fear not, Mary:
31 for thou hast found favour with God. And, behold, thou shalt
conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his
32 name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of
the Most High: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne
33 of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob
34 for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.' Then said
Mary unto the angel, 'How shall this be, seeing I know no man?'
35 And the angel answered and said unto her, 'The Holy Spirit will
come upon thee, and the power of the Most High will overshadow
thee: therefore also the holy thing which is to be born shall be
36 called Son of God. And, behold, thy kinswoman Elisabeth, she
hath also conceived a son in her old age: and this is the sixth
37 month with her who was called barren. For no word which
38 cometh from God shall be void of power.' And Mary said, 'Behold
I am the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy
word.' And the angel departed from her.

26. The story of the birth of Jesus in Luke is very different from the story in Matthew, and indeed contradicts it in some important points and in some minor details. *Cp.* Carpenter, *First Three Gospels*, pp. 92–114.

Nazareth is Mary's dwelling-place or home. According to Matthew she must have lived in Bethlehem.

27. Joseph, not Mary, is of the royal Davidic house. The descent of Jesus from David was traced through his father. In Luke's birth story (unlike that of Matthew) it is probable that the

idea of the virgin birth was interpolated by the insertion of 34 and 35.

If Jesus had no human father, it is of no value that Joseph was a descendant of David. The only real question is whether the interpolation was made by Luke into his source, or by a later 'editor' of Luke. Loisy thinks the former, Harnack the latter. The inconsistency which one has to assume if the interpolation was made by Luke is, Loisy thinks, not greater than is found elsewhere in the book.

31. The words are clearly modelled upon Isaiah vii. 14.

32. In this verse Jesus is only called Son of God in the Messianic sense. There is no need to interpret the phrase physiologically or metaphysically.

33. The description of the Messiah is cast in a very Jewish form. The wording, says J. Weiss, clearly betrays its Jewish-Christian origin.

34. The reply of Mary makes the interpolation clear. As Mary was already betrothed, her astonishment that she should shortly bear a son is very unlikely and inappropriate.

35. The more probable translation is that of R.V. mg., 'the holy thing which is to be born.' Here the Son of God is used in a physiological sense, quite differently from 32. 'What we read in this verse, namely, the physical interpretation of the term, comes from Greek ways of thought: den heidenchristlichen Gemeinden lag es sehr nahe, den Sohn Gottes als von Gott abstammend vorzustellen' (J. Weiss). So Jews have said for 1800 years. And, now, a Lutheran theological professor may calmly say the same thing. It is a tremendous advance for the cause of Judaism.

Merx supposes that the interpolation is much smaller and is limited to the words 'seeing I know no man.' 'How shall this be' means merely 'how shall such an honour befall me.' Then in the reply of the angel, the words 'come upon thee' and 'overshadow' thee, refer simply to the protection of the Holy Spirit, not to physical begetting. 'Spirit' is feminine in Hebrew and this would make the usual interpretation very inapt. But if the interpolation comes from a Gentile-Christian hand the objection raised by Merx hardly applies. And doubtless, as Loisy says, the signification of 'will overshadow thee' (ἐπισκιάσει) is local, not moral. Both the terminology of the idea, and the idea itself are foreign to Hebrew thought, as Loisy very properly states. 'Quant au fond même de l'idée, il ne s'accorde pas mieux

avec la théologie juive en ce qui fait l'originalité propre de celle-ci, à savoir la notion de la transcendance divine, qui ne permet guère de concevoir Dieu comme le principe générateur, physique et immédiat, d'une vie humaine individuelle. En grec et pour l'esprit hellénique, ces embarras n'existent pas. L'apologiste Justin trouvait tout naturel de comparer la naissance de Jésus à celle des héros ou demi-dieux, nés d'un dieu et d'une mortelle' (*E. S.* I. p. 292).

37. *Cp.* Genesis xviii. 14. Either *ῥῆμα* here, like the Hebrew *dabar*, must be taken to equal 'thing': 'nothing is impossible for God,' or keeping 'word,' the meaning is (R.V.), 'no word from God shall be without effect.' The sign is almost grotesque unless 34 and 35 were interpolated either in the 'source' or in the Gospel. As Loisy says: 'Un signe est-il nécessaire avec ou après le miracle de la conception virginale? Un plus grand prodige a-t-il besoin d'être garanti par un moindre? La comparaison de ces deux conceptions ne devient-elle pas forcée, presque choquante, si l'une des deux ressemble si peu à l'autre?' (*E. S.* I. p. 293). But Spitta has some good arguments to prove that 36 and 37 are interpolated as well as 34 and 35. 38 follows, with simplicity and dignity, 33. That Mary was to become the mother of the Messiah is inadequately and unnecessarily proved by the fact that Elisabeth had become pregnant in her old age. That Mary should have a son was not unlikely or wonderful. That this son should be the Messiah is not well guaranteed by Elisabeth's pregnancy. But as an argument from the less to the greater it holds. It is of one piece. God who can make an old woman have a baby, can also make a virgin have a baby. (*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, VII. 1906, p. 289.)

38. If Mary had not spoken already, her obedient questionless acceptance of the angel's message is in fine contrast to Zacharias's doubts. If 34 is not interpolated, Mary at first showed the same scepticism as he.

39–56. THE VISIT OF MARY TO ELISABETH

(Luke only)

39 And Mary arose in those days, and went into the hill country
40 with haste, into a city of Judah; and entered the house of
41 Zacharias, and greeted Elisabeth. And it came to pass, that,
when Elisabeth heard the greeting of Mary, the babe leaped in
42 her womb. And Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit, and

she lifted up her voice and cried aloud, and said, 'Blessed be thou
43 among women, and blessed be the fruit of thy womb. And where-
fore have I this honour that the mother of my Lord should come
44 to me? For, lo, as soon as the voice of thy greeting reached mine
45 ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy. And happy is she who
believed that what was told her from the Lord shall be fulfilled.'

46, 47 And Mary said, 'My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my
48 spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. For he hath regarded
the low estate of his handmaiden: for, behold, from henceforth all
49 generations shall account me happy. For he that is mighty hath
50 done to me great things; and holy is his name. And his mercy
51 is from generation to generation upon them that fear him. He
hath shown strength with his arm; he hath scattered the proud
52 in the imagination of their hearts. He hath cast down the mighty
53 from their thrones, and exalted them of low degree. He hath
filled the hungry with good things; and the rich he hath sent
54 empty away. He hath helped his servant Israel, that he might
55 remember his mercy to Abraham and to his seed for ever, even
56 as he spoke unto our fathers.' And Mary remained with her
about three months, and then she returned to her own home.

The two annunciation stories of John and Jesus are now brought together. There has probably been some editing in the process. One object is to show the inferiority of John to Jesus—of the 'forerunner' to the Messiah and Son of God.

39. The object of Mary's visit was to verify the sign after having experienced the truth of the promise. The 'source' doubtless told how Mary conceived, just as it told (in 24) how Elisabeth had done so (Loisy).

41. *Cp.* Genesis xxv. 22. The unborn child, in accordance with the prediction of 15, and in virtue of its already being filled with the Holy Spirit, recognizes the mother of the Messiah.

43. Even the mother of John knows that Mary's son is to be the Messiah. In Matt. iii. 14 John recognizes Jesus to be the Messiah at the baptism. The historic reality was more in accordance with Matt. xi. 3.

45. 'Happy is she who believed that what was told her from the Lord shall be fulfilled.' The 'she' is Mary.

46. 'And Mary said.' It has been almost conclusively proved that the word 'Mary' is a later insertion. Originally the so-called 'Magnificat' was said by Elisabeth. It belongs to the story of John's birth, and not to that of Jesus. It is, therefore, probably pre-Christian, or rather non-Christian, and was only taken over by the compiler of chapters i. and ii. and then ascribed to Mary. It is composed altogether on Old Testament lines and of Old Testament reminiscences, and has no reference to the coming of the Messiah. It is closely parallel to the song of Hannah, 1 Samuel ii. 1–10.

48. The language is only appropriate to Elisabeth. *ταπείνωσις*, 'low estate,' does not mean 'humble social condition,' but only 'humiliation,' *i.e.* the humiliation of childlessness. *Cp.* 1 Sam. i. 11, where the Septuagint has the very word. The words: 'Henceforth all generations shall account me happy' (or 'blessed') are based upon Gen. xxx. 13 (see especially the Septuagint). Prof. Burkitt in his article 'Who spoke the Magnificat?' also strongly urges that the hymn was originally put into the mouth of Elisabeth.

49–55. The remainder of the hymn is full of Old Testament reminiscences, and is throughout based upon its prototype, the psalm of Hannah. It is made to resemble Hannah's song, even in its inappropriateness to the situation and in the generalities of its language.

54. 'His servant.' But S.S. has 'his son' which is, Merx thinks, original. The change is purposive. Only Jesus is God's Son.

57–80. Birth of John the Baptist

(Luke only)

57 Now Elisabeth's time was completed that she should be
58 delivered; and she brought forth a son. And her neighbours
and her kinsfolk heard how the Lord had magnified his pity upon
59 her; and they rejoiced with her. And it came to pass, that on
the eighth day they came to circumcise the child; and they
60 intended to call him Zacharias, after the name of his father. But
his mother answered and said, 'No; but he shall be called John.'
61 And they said unto her, 'There is none of thy kindred that is
62 called by this name.' And they made signs to his father, how he
63 would have him called. And he asked for a writing tablet, and
64 wrote, saying, 'His name is John.' And they marvelled all. And
immediately his mouth was opened, and his tongue, and he spoke,

65 and praised God. And fear came on all their neighbours: and all
these stories were talked about through all the hill country of
66 Judæa. And all they that heard them laid them up in their
hearts, saying, 'What then will this child be!' For the hand
of the Lord was with him.

67 And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Spirit, and
68 prophesied, saying, 'Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel; for he
69 hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up an horn
70 of salvation for us in the house of his servant David;—as he
spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets, who have been from of
71 old;—salvation from our enemies, and from the hand of all that
72 hate us; to show pity to our fathers, and to remember his holy
73 covenant; the oath which he sware to our father Abraham,
74 to grant unto us, that we, being delivered out of the hand of our
75 enemies, should serve him without fear, in holiness and right-
76 eousness before him, all the days of our life. And thou, child,
shalt be called the prophet of the Most High: for thou shalt go
77 before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways; to give know-
ledge of salvation unto his people in the forgiveness of their sins,
78 because of the tender mercy of our God, whereby the dayspring
79 from on high will visit us, to give light to them that sit in dark-
ness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of
80 peace.' And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, and was
in the wilderness till the day of his manifestation unto Israel.

60. Elisabeth, like Mary, is inspired by the Holy Spirit, and knows that the name is given by divine appointment to her son.

62. Zacharias has become deaf as well as dumb. κωφός (22) can mean both.

66. 'For the hand of the Lord was with him.' The meaning apparently is: people were justified in wondering what great future was in store for the child, for in addition to the marvels of his naming, God's hand was with him as he grew up. (*Cp.* 80.)

68. The hymn of praise spoken by Zacharias may also be due, at least in part, to the independent story of John. It may have been rendered more suitable to its present environment by the additions of 69 and 70 and 78 and 79*a*. Others suppose by 76 and 77 only.

The first part of the hymn is couched in regular Old Testament language and is quite Jewish in tone. Loisy supposes it to be the work of some Jewish-Christian writer.

69. The 'horn' is the Messiah. Grammatically and in sense 71 fits on well to 68. As the text now stands, 'salvation' is in opposition to the 'horn.'

76. Up to this point the hymn has spoken of the coming deliverance, and of the re-establishment of the theocracy and of the Davidic monarchy, in quite ordinary Old Testament phrases. It now turns to the destiny of the child John. His office is described in phrases taken from Isaiah xl. 3 and Malachi iii. 1.

77. The end of the verse seems (in spite of Völter) to recall and be based upon Mark i. 4. It can hardly be independent. (Völter would make his Christian editor's work confined to 78 and 79 *a*.)

78. The connection is certainly rather awkward and cumbrous. 78 fits on best to 75. The MSS. vary between future ('shall visit') and aorist ('has visited').

The 'dayspring from on high' is the dawn of the Messianic glory. The phrase is based upon such Old Testament passages as Malachi iv. 2; Isaiah ix. 2, lviii. 8, lx. 1; Numbers xxiv. 17.

79. In the first part of the verse Isaiah ix. 2, xlii. 7, find their echo.

80. *Cp.* Judges xiii. 24, 25, or 1 Sam. ii. 11, iii. 19–21.

CHAPTER II

1–20. The Birth of Jesus

(Luke only)

1 And it came to pass in those days, that a decree was issued
from the Emperor Augustus, that there should be a census of the
2 whole world. (This, the first census, took place while Cyrenius
3 was governor of Syria.) And all went to be enrolled, each man
4 to his own city. And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of
the city of Nazareth, to Judæa, unto the city of David, which is
called Bethlehem; (because he was of the house and family of
5 David:) to be enrolled with Mary who was betrothed to him and
6 was with child. And it happened that, while they were there,
7 the days were completed for her delivery. And she brought forth
her firstborn son, and wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid
him in a manger; because there was no room for them in the inn.

8 And there were in the same region shepherds in the fields,
9 keeping watch over their flock by night. And an angel of the
Lord stood by them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about
10 them: and they were sore afraid. And the angel said unto them,
'Fear not: for, behold, I proclaim to you the good tidings of great
11 joy, which shall be to all the people. For unto you hath been
born this day in the city of David a Saviour, who is Messiah,
12 Lord. And this is a sign for you; ye shall find a babe wrapped
13 in swaddling clothes, in a manger.' And suddenly there was with
the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and
14 saying, 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among
men of his favour.'

15 And it came to pass, when the angels were gone away from
them into heaven, the shepherds said one to another, 'Let us now

go unto Bethlehem, and see this thing which is come to pass,
16 which the Lord has made known unto us.' And they came with
haste, and found Mary, and Joseph, and the babe lying in the
17 manger. And when they had seen it, they made known abroad
the word which had been spoken to them concerning this child.
18 And all they that heard it wondered at those things which were
19 told them by the shepherds. But Mary kept all these things in
20 mind, and pondered over them in her heart. And the shepherds
returned, glorifying and praising God for all the things that they
had heard and seen, as it had been told unto them.

1–4. It is unnecessary for my purpose to enter into the details of the enormous discussions and interminable arguments which the statements made in these verses have called forth. Suffice it to say that Luke in all probability has sought to use for his own special purpose an enrolment, or rather census for taxation, which was conducted by Quirinius, Governor of Syria, in 6 or 7 A.D. This census caused a great deal of commotion and indignation, as we learn from Josephus. Luke refers again to this enrolment or census in the Acts, and to the rising of Judas the Galilæan (Acts v. 37). But Jesus was certainly not born as late as 6 or 7 A.D. Most probably Luke is right in fixing the date of his birth before the death of Herod, 4 B.C., at which time such a census did not take, and could not have taken, place. Luke uses the census in order to make Jesus born at Bethlehem. The necessity for the birth of Bethlehem arose as a consequence of Jesus's Messiahship. For a well-known passage in Micah (v. 2) deliberately asserts that the Messiah is to be born in Bethlehem. Therefore Jesus must have been born there. He was, however, known to have been a Galilæan, an inhabitant of Nazareth. Luke's story, therefore, suggests a way out, and its improbabilities or impossibilities were in those times of no difficulty or trouble. *Cp.* Loisy: 'It was because he was Messiah, son of David, that Jesus had to be born at Bethlehem. So some reason was necessary which compelled Joseph, son of David, and with him Mary, and with Mary Jesus, to go to Bethlehem. What reason could present itself more naturally to the Christian imagination than that of an enrolment of Davidic descendants at the traditional birthplace of their race? But the family of David could not be enrolled unless others were enrolled too; hence the necessity for the enrolment of every family. Now there was an enrolment which had remained in everybody's memory, the first enrolment, that of Quirinius; so it was the enrolment of Quirinius which had made Joseph and Mary come to Bethlehem, and it was thus that Jesus was born there. What this enrolment had actually been there was no precise recollection, but people always spoke of the enrolment and of Judas the Galilæan' (*E. S.* I. p. 345).

1. An enrolment of all the world, or even of all the empire, under Augustus did not take place. But there were censuses of all Roman citizens in 26 and 6 B.C. and in 14 A.D. But such censuses would not fit with the story's needs, not even that of 6 B.C., for it did not extend to the countries which were still semi-independent, such as Judæa remained till 6 A.D. And even then, Galilee, as part of the territory of the tetrarch Herod Antipas would have been exempt from such a census.

2. 'This, the first enrolment (in Judæa), took place when Cyrenius (or Quirinius) was governor of Syria.' This is the probable meaning, not, 'This was the first enrolment made when Quirinius was governor of Syria,' though either rendering is possible, and the second is adopted by many scholars.

3. No Roman census was conducted in this strange way. Joseph would have been enrolled in Nazareth, not in a city where his ancestors had dwelt hundreds of years before. Few Jews would have had this familiar knowledge of their own far-off ancestry. And in any case why should Mary have gone with him that long journey, being not yet his wife and in her pregnant condition? As Holtzmann says, the machinery used to get Mary to Bethlehem works very clumsily. Schürer has pointed out that women, though they paid a poll tax, had not personally to appear at the census, as is here implied. Spitta and other scholars have attempted to show that Luke's narrative may after all be historical. Spitta, for instance, thinks that the author did not intend to make Mary already with child when she visited Elisabeth. The babe in the womb of i. 41 salutes not the unborn Messiah, but his mother. The fruit of the womb which is declared blessed in i. 42 is still to come. 'In those days' in ii. 1 refers to John's youth, not to his birth. John was older than Jesus. Thus ii. 1 relates to a later time than i. 5 or i. 31. The census or enrolment took place in an earlier governorship of Quirinius, soon after Herod's death. The word *οἰκουμένη* in ii. 1 is a mistranslation of the Aramaic original. It should be 'land,' not 'earth,' and points to a period after Herod's death but before the partition of his monarchy among Archelaus, Antipas and Philip. It is conceivable that Joseph had some land in Bethlehem, the more so, if he was really descended from David. Verse 3 generalizes in the manner of a popular story. ('Die chronologischen Notizen und die Hymnen in Lc. i. und ii.' in *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissen-*

schaft, VII. 1906, pp. 280–303.) There *is* some evidence that Quirinius was governor of Syria about 3 B.C. as well as 6 A.D. But the total number of unlikely suppositions which have to be made before Luke's story of Jesus's birth can be regarded as historical, is very large. The hypothesis that the story is legendary still remains much the simplest and most probable. *Cp.* also *Encyc. Biblica, s. v.* 'Quirinius,' and Carpenter, *First Three Gospels*, pp. 112–114.

4. It will be remembered that it was pointed out that i. 34, 35 were probably a later insertion, and that Luke's birth story, unlike that of Matthew, did not originally include a virgin birth. In this verse there is some evidence that the original reading was 'with Mary his wife.' This is the reading of S.S. (See *Encyc. Biblica, s.v.* 'Nativity,' III. column 3349 ad fin.)

7. Jesus is the firstborn, but for Luke, as well as for Mark, he is not Mary's only child. The stall or manger in the stable is a pretty feature of the legend to indicate the contrast between the earthly environment of the Messiah's birth with his destiny and person. Jesus is a spiritual shepherd. The real reason, says Loisy, why Jesus has to be born in a stable is to establish a connection between the shepherd David and himself (*E. S.* I. p. 348, n. 5).

8. The story of the shepherds has Old Testament parallels. We may also compare the birth stories of Cyrus and Romulus. Apparently to this writer and for this legend Jesus was not born in winter. The flocks in Palestine are not out at night in December.

11. The phrasing is a little strange. It may be translated as in the text, or thus: 'a saviour, that is, an anointed Lord.' J. Weiss thinks that the phrase is impossible. It is an error of the Greek translator of his Aramaic source, and should be, 'the Messiah of the Lord' (*i.e.* of God).

14. The reading is not quite certain. If the genitive *εὐδοκίας* is read, the translation is, 'And on earth peace among men of (his) favour,' *i.e.* either among the Jews, who are the people of his choice, or among those men who by their acceptance and acknowledgment of the Messiah receive the divine favour. To unbelievers there will be no peace. A less good reading has the nominative, 'On earth peace, and favour among men.' Loisy prefers it. He regards it as a Messianic acclamation and affirmation. God acquires honour, the earth peace, men divine grace, by the birth of the Messiah.

15. Here again ῥῆμα seems to be equivalent to 'thing,' 'event.' Or we must render: 'This word which has come to pass, and which the Lord made known to us.'

19. The stories about Mary's astonishment concerning her son's preaching in Mark show that the historic mother of Jesus was quite unaware that she had given birth to the Messiah. συνβάλλουσα, rendered by R.V. 'pondering,' is rendered by Holtzmann 'interpreting.' The verse, Loisy thinks, was added by the Evangelist himself. Mary showed the religious interest which befitted the mother of the Messiah.

21–24. Circumcision and Redemption of Jesus

(Luke only)

21 And when the eight days for the circumcision of the child were completed, his name was called Jesus, according as he had been
22 named by the angel before he was conceived in the womb. And when the days of their purification, according to the Law of Moses, were completed, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present him
23 to the Lord; (as it is written in the Law of the Lord, 'Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord';)
24 and to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the Law of the Lord, 'A pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons.'

22. '*Their* purification' is odd, as the Law (Lev. xii.) says nothing of the father. It is still more odd if the mother was a virgin, just as under such circumstances the law of purification itself seems hardly in keeping. The original reading must have been 'her' for 'their,' which the S.S. still has. The alteration is due to a shy attempt, carried further by some MSS., which have 'his,' to obscure the fact that the immaculate virgin was regarded as levitically unclean after child-birth. The end of the verse, 'to present him to the Lord,' refers to the redemption of the first-born (Exodus xiii. 2, 13). But it is also influenced by 1 Samuel i. 24.

24. *Cp.* Lev. xii. 8. The offering is the sacrifice laid down for those whose 'means suffice not for a lamb.'

25–35. Simeon

(Luke only)

25 And, behold, there was a man in Jerusalem, whose name was Simeon; and this man was just and devout, waiting for the con-

26 solation of Israel: and the Holy Spirit was upon him. And it
was revealed unto him by the Holy Spirit that he should not see
27 death before he had seen the Messiah of the Lord. And he came
by the Spirit into the temple: and when the parents brought in
the child Jesus, to do concerning him after the custom of the Law,
28 he took him up in his arms, and blessed God, and said:

29 'Now releasest thou thy servant, O Lord, in peace, according
30, 31 to thy word, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou
32 hast prepared before the face of all the peoples, a light of revelation
to the nations, and of glory to thy people Israel.'

33 And his father and his mother marvelled at what was spoken
34 of him. And Simeon blessed them, and said unto Mary his
mother, 'Behold, this child is appointed for the fall and rising
35 again of many in Israel; and for a sign to be opposed, (yea, a
sword shall pierce through thy own soul also,) that the thoughts
of many hearts may be revealed.'

25. *παράκλησις* 'comfort' or 'consolation.' *Cp.* the famous opening words of Isaiah xl.

27. Note 'the parents' in the plural. The story-teller knows nothing apparently of the virgin birth. *Cp.* verses 33, 41, 43, 48.

29. He could now die in peace. The promise of God—his own heart's desire as it was the desire of every pious Israelite—had been fulfilled.

30, 31. The wording is closely modelled upon Psalm xcviii. 2. *Cp.* also Isaiah lii. 10.

32. The salvation is to be a light which is to bring revelation to the nations (Isaiah xlii. 6, xlix. 6), and glory to Israel (Isaiah xlvi. 13).

33. This story must in its source have been independent of the whole story of the annunciation, for otherwise why should Mary at least be astonished?

34. Simeon's second speech seems more directly due to the Evangelist.

κεῖται, 'is set for,' 'is marked out for,' 'is destined for.'

Jesus is a stumbling-block (Isaiah viii. 14) to those who disbelieve in him. *Cp.* Matt. xxi. 44. He is also a sign, a signal, which is (not only accepted and hailed, but also) opposed and contradicted. For the 'sign' *cp.* Isaiah xi. 12, xiii. 2, where the Greek has the same word as here, *σημεῖον.* J. Weiss thinks the words: 'and rising again' (*ἀνάστασιν*) have been added. It refers to 'rising' through repentance and forgiveness of sins. But originally the verse referred only to those who would reject Jesus. So too Loisy.

35. The martyrdom of Jesus shall be a martyrdom to his mother. The first clause of the verse seems an interpolation, and the second clause really depends upon 34. The object of the rejection of the Messiah is that the innermost thoughts, the true characters, of all may be laid bare.

36–39. ANNA

(Luke only)

36 And there was a prophetess, Anna, the daughter of Phanuel,
of the tribe of Asher: she was of a great age, having lived with
37 an husband seven years from her virginity, and as a widow even
for eighty-four years. She departed not from the temple, worship-
38 ping with fastings and prayers night and day. And she came up
at the same time, and gave thanks unto God, and spoke of the
child to all that were waiting for the redemption of Jerusalem.

39 And when they had accomplished all things according to the Law of the Lord, they returned to Galilee, unto their own city Nazareth.

36. Man and woman, prophet and prophetess, must testify to the Messiah. The cumbrous words mean that Anna was only once married, that she had lived with her husband seven years, and after his death had remained a widow for eighty-four years. She must have therefore been, if she married say at fifteen, one hundred and six years old. That she did not marry again is looked upon as to her credit. *Cp.* 1 Tim. v. 9. As to the custom of women praying in the Temple, see Additional Note 51.

38. *ἐπιστᾶσα.* She stood by, or came up near to, Simeon. *ἐλάλει περὶ αὐτοῦ*, literally, 'she spoke of him,' *i.e.* about the child. The 'redemption' of Jerusalem is the advent of the Messiah.

39. Thus forty days or so after Jesus's birth the parents return to Nazareth. The contradiction with Matt. ii. 20 is

apparent. The reading of the S.S is very interesting. 'Joseph and Mary after they had performed in the Temple everything *to the firstborn* which the Law ordains, returned,' *i.e.* as Merx says, we have to understand that Mary and Joseph were a newly married couple, and that Jesus was their first child.

40–52. A STORY FROM THE BOYHOOD OF JESUS

(Luke only)

40 And the child grew, and waxed strong, being filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him.

41 Now his parents went to Jerusalem every year at the feast of
42 the Passover. And when he was twelve years old, they went up
43 to Jerusalem after the custom of the feast. And when they had
fulfilled the days and were returning, the child Jesus tarried
44 behind in Jerusalem; and his parents knew it not. But, sup-
posing that he was in the caravan, they went a day's journey; and
45 they sought for him among their kinsfolk and acquaintance. And
when they found him not, they returned to Jerusalem in search of
46 him. And it came to pass, that after three days they found him
in the temple, sitting in the midst of the Teachers, listening to
47 them, and asking them questions. And all that heard him were
48 astonished at his understanding and answers. And when they
saw him, they were amazed: and his mother said unto him, 'Son,
why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold, thy father and I have
49 been seeking thee sorrowing.' And he said unto them, 'Why did
ye seek me? did ye not know that I must be in my Father's
50 house?' And they understood not the word which he spoke unto
51 them. So he went down with them, and came to Nazareth, and
was subject unto them. And his mother kept all these sayings in
52 her heart. And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in
favour with God and with men.

40 is a parallel to i. 80, where much the same thing is said of John.

41. Following the precedent of Samuel, the parents of Jesus in this clearly legendary story, for which the life of Buddha offers so striking a parallel, come up to Jerusalem only once a year, not, as the Law enjoins, three times. It is, however, likely that the triple visit in the year was often neglected.

44. Kinsmen and friends and townsfolk made up caravans and parties for the festival. They went to, and returned from, Jerusalem more or less together.

46. The child is not teaching, but learning. He listens and questions.

48. The language is hardly compatible with a knowledge of his Messiahship, still less with that of the virgin birth. Still more curious is 50. It is odd how these various legends do not seek or require to be consistent in detail or tone with each other.

49 *τί ὅτι, i.e.* Why?

ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου means probably 'in my Father's house.

The wording in 48 resembles Mark iii. 32. It is probable that the use of this pretty legend serves for Luke as an equivalent for that part of Mark iii. 21, 31–35 which he did not incorporate in his viii. 19–21. The rebuke which Jesus in Mark iii. 33 gives to his mother is reproduced in this story, but in a milder form. The filial obedience of Jesus is indicated in 51 as a corrective to any false or exaggerated inferences which might be drawn from 49. For 52 *cp.* 1 Samuel ii. 26. The phrase 'in my Father's house' does not necessarily imply a knowledge on Jesus's part of the story of the virgin birth. The two legends may be quite independent of each other. As Loisy says (*E. S.* I. pp. 381 *seq.*), it would seem as if there were an intentional and marked opposition in the words 'my Father' of Jesus's answer to the words of Mary, 'Thy father and I.' The antithesis seems to us in bad taste, but may conceivably have been intended by Luke. Probably in the original story, the words ran 'And *they* said to him, We have been looking for you,' &c. (For Jesus replies to *them.*) On the other hand, even in the source, 'my Father' had, Loisy thinks, a special meaning. Not indeed that God was his Father and not Joseph, but that God was specially his Father, because he was the Messiah. Hence his parents do not understand his reply, though Luke, to soften this answer, adds 51*b*. But 'on n'a pas coutume de retenir avec soin les choses qu'on n'a pas comprises.'

CHAPTER III

1–20. JOHN THE BAPTIST

(*Cp.* Mark i. 1–8; Matt. iii. 1–12; and Mark vi. 17–29;
Matt. xiv. 3–12)

1 Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of the Emperor Tiberius,
Pontius Pilate being governor of Judæa, and Herod being tetrarch
of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Ituræa and of the
2 region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene, Annas
and Caiaphas being the high priests, the word of God came unto
3 John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness. And he came into
all the country around the Jordan, proclaiming the baptism of
4 repentance for the forgiveness of sins; as it is written in the book
of the words of Isaiah the prophet, saying, 'The voice of one
crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make
5 his paths straight. Every valley shall be filled up, and every
mountain and hill shall be brought low; and the crooked shall be
6 made straight, and the rough ways shall be made smooth; and all
flesh shall see the salvation of God.'

7 Then said he to the crowds that came out to be baptized of
him, 'O offspring of vipers, who hath suggested to you to flee
8 from the wrath to come? Bring forth, then, fruits befitting
repentance, and begin not to say to yourselves, We have Abraham
for father: for I say unto you that God is able to raise up
9 children unto Abraham from these stones. Already is the axe
laid unto the root of the trees: every tree, then, which bringeth
not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.'

10 And the crowds asked him, saying, 'What, then, shall we do?'
11 He answered and said unto them, 'He that hath two coats, let
him give a share to him that hath none; and he that hath food,
let him do likewise.'

12 Then came also tax-collectors to be baptized, and they said
13 unto him, 'Master, what shall we do?' And he said unto them,
'Exact no more than that which is ordered you.'

14 And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, 'And what
shall *we* do?' And he said unto them, 'Practise extortion to
none, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your pay.'

15 And as the people were in expectation, and all men were
pondering in their hearts about John, whether he might not be
16 the Messiah, John answered, saying unto them all, 'I baptize you
with water; but one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose
shoes I am not worthy to unloose; *he* will baptize you with the
17 Holy Spirit and with fire. His winnowing fan is in his hand to
purify his threshing floor, and to gather the wheat into his garner;
18 but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire.' And with
many other exhortations he proclaimed the good tidings unto the
people.

19 But Herod the tetrarch, being reproved by him about Herodias
his brother Philip's wife, and about all the other wickednesses
20 which he had done, added yet this unto all, that he shut up John
in prison.

After the introductory two chapters Luke gives the story of the ministry in Galilee from iii. to ix. 50. Here he mainly follows the order and the framework of Mark. And what in this section is not from Mark is largely from Q.

1. The fifteenth year of Tiberius is 28–29 A.D. Hence if the ministry of Jesus lasted about a year, the crucifixion, according to Luke, must have taken place in 29 or 30, probably the latter.

2. The real high priest was Caiaphas. Annas was his father-in-law. He had been high priest from 6 to 15 A.D., and was still an influential personality in Jerusalem.

6. 'All flesh.' 'It was obviously for the sake of this declaration that Luke continued the quotation thus far. That the salvation of God is to be made known to the whole human race is the main theme of his Gospel' (Plummer; and so B. Weiss). 'L'abaissement des hauteurs signifie le nivellement des conditions' (*E. S.* I. p. 393).

7. In Matthew this speech is addressed, not to the 'crowd,' but to the Pharisees and Sadducees.

10–14. An interesting insertion of Luke. To B. Weiss an insertion from 'L.' But this is less likely. The point of view is different from, and milder than, 7–9. The demands made are not very high. This is perhaps intentional, by way of contrast to the demands of Jesus. (The tax-collectors and soldiers are both Jews.) So W. The passage, says J. Weiss, is interesting as giving us an insight into John's teaching. The simple duties of man to man, justice and compassion—these are to him the fruits of repentance which God demands. In all this he is a true successor of the old prophets. Nevertheless we may take it that the passage is Luke's own creation, though dramatically not incorrect.

15. Luke only. We do not elsewhere in the Synoptics hear that John was regarded by any as the Messiah. Is this verse the creation of Luke to serve as an introduction to 16, 17? *Cp.* John i. 19–25.

18, 19. Luke anticipates and briefly sums up the later parallels in Mark and Matthew. He does not mention the death of John. But he too accepts the historic order, namely, that Jesus did not begin to preach till John's work was interrupted by his incarceration.

21, 22. THE BAPTISM OF JESUS

(*Cp.* Mark i. 9–11; Matt. iii. 13–17)

21 Now it came to pass, when all the people had been baptized, and Jesus had also been baptized, and was praying, that the
22 heaven was opened, and the Holy Spirit descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, 'Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased.'

22. The reading of D is: 'Thou art my Son: I have begotten thee this day,' a quotation from Psalm ii. If this, as some think, is the true original reading, it would show that Luke, in its original form, knew nothing of the miraculous birth. To the divine Son the baptism could bring no new, special relation to God. (*Cp.* Pfleiderer, *Urchristentum*, I. p. 417.) For an elaborate defence of the reading which D and other sources give, see Spitta's essay, 'Beiträge zur Erklärung der Synoptiker,' in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, V. 1904, pp. 308–316. Spitta uses the reading to substantiate his view that Luke constantly presents earlier versions of events and speeches than either Mark or Matthew, because Luke made independent use of the 'Grundschrift,' and often preserved it to us in little altered form.

Conybeare also holds that the primitive reading is that preserved in D. 'The idea conveyed is that Jesus was spiritually reborn or regenerated on this occasion, a new soul, as it were, being engendered in him by the spirit which now entered into him and thenceforth inspired his words and actions' (*Myth, Magic and Morals*, p. 172).

The miracle is pressed and hardened. The insistence on the bodily form occurs only in Luke. The interlude of prayer is interesting. 'On croirait assister, et l'on assiste en effet, à un baptême dans les premières communautés chrétiennes.' For after immersion the custom was to pray to obtain the Spirit. Jesus's baptism is a prototype of Christian baptism (*E. S.* I. p. 411).

23–38. The Genealogy of Jesus

(*Cp.* Matt. i. 1–17)

23 And Jesus himself, at the beginning, was about thirty years
of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, the son
24 of Heli, the son of Matthat, the son of Levi, the son of Melchi,
25 the son of Jannai, the son of Joseph, the son of Mattathias,
the son of Amos, the son of Nahum, the son of Esli, the son
26 of Naggai, the son of Maath, the son of Mattathias, the son of
27 Semein, the son of Josech, the son of Joda, the son of Joanna,
the son of Rhesa, the son of Zerubbabel, the son of Shealthiel,
28 the son of Neri, the son of Melchi, the son of Addi, the son of
29 Cosam, the son of Elmadam, the son of Er, the son of Jesus, the
son of Eliezer, the son of Jorim, the son of Matthat, the son of
30 Levi, the son of Simeon, the son of Judas, the son of Joseph, the
31 son of Jonam, the son of Eliakim, the son of Melea, the son of
Menna, the son of Mattatha, the son of Nathan, the son of David,
32 the son of Jesse, the son of Obed, the son of Boaz, the son of
33 Salmon, the son of Nahshon, the son of Amminadab, the son of
Arni, the son of Admin, the son of Hezron, the son of Perez, the
34 son of Judah, the son of Jacob, the son of Isaac, the son of
35 Abraham, the son of Terah, the son of Nahor, the son of Serug,
the son of Reu, the son of Peleg, the son of Eber, the son of
36 Shelah, the son of Cainan, the son of Arphaxad, the son of Shem,
37 the son of Noah, the son of Lamech, the son of Methuselah, the
son of Enoch, the son of Jared, the son of Mahalaleel, the son of
38 Cainan, the son of Enos, the son of Seth, the son of Adam, the son
of God.

23. It is interesting that the genealogy is put here, and not in chapters i., ii. Its source must have been different from any sources used by Luke in i. and ii. If Jesus was thirty years old at the beginning of his ministry, and if this lasted about a year, he would have been born about 1 B.C. or 1 A.D. According to i. 5, however, he was born before the death of Herod, *i.e.* 4 B.C. And if ii. 2 is accurate, he was born 6 A.D. In that case the crucifixion occurred in 35 A.D., which Holtzmann considers a possible date. But, as we have seen, there is every reason to suppose that ii. 2 is not accurate. Though Jesus may have been born in B.C. 4 and yet have died as late as 35 A.D., it is more probable that his death occurred in 29 or 30. The word *ἀρχόμενος* used thus absolutely is odd and provokes suspicion. Conybeare thinks the text has been 'much disturbed.' 'When he began' is usually made to refer to the commencement of his public ministry, but Spitta (*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, VII. p. 66) points out that the public ministry only opens in iv. 15. The time reference is to the baptism, the account of which has just been given. Hence Spitta supposes that *ἀρχόμενος* refers to Jesus beginning to be the Son of God, and Conybeare thinks that words to this effect must originally have followed on *ἀρχόμενος*, but that they were omitted so as not to conflict with the later view that Jesus was divine from his birth (*op. cit.* p. 177).

The genealogy is inconsistent with chapter i. 35. Whoever drew it up clearly did not believe that Jesus had no human father, for, if so, the genealogy has no point. The final redactor of Luke thinks well to append and include the genealogy, but adds that it is inaccurate. Jesus was thought to be the son of Joseph, but in reality he was not. The list of names differs somewhat from that of Matthew; Jesus, it may be noticed, is not descended from Solomon, but from another of David's sons. Moreover in contrast to Matthew, the genealogical tree is pushed up to Adam, for Jesus is the 'Second Adam.' (*Cp.* Romans v. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 22, 45-49.) Adam is 'Son of God,' as well as Jesus. The sonship was not yet a fixed dogmatic idea; Jesus was not the only son. 'That Luke should take the genealogy beyond David and Abraham to the father of the whole human race is entirely in harmony with the Pauline universality of his Gospel' (Plummer).

CHAPTER IV

1–13. THE TEMPTATION

(*Cp.* Mark i. 12, 13; Matt. iv. 1–11)

1 And Jesus being full of the Holy Spirit returned from Jordan,
2 and was driven about by the Spirit in the wilderness, for forty
days, tempted by the Devil. And in those days he ate nothing:
3 and when they were ended, he hungered. And the Devil said
unto him, 'If thou be the Son of God, say to this stone that it
4 become bread.' And Jesus answered him, saying, 'It is written,
5 Man shall not live by bread alone.' And the Devil, taking him
up, shewed unto him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment
6 of time. And the Devil said unto him, 'All this power will I give
thee, and the glory of them: for it is delivered unto me; and to
7 whomsoever I will I give it. If, then, thou wilt do reverence
8 before me, all shall be thine.' And Jesus answered and said unto
him, 'It is written, Thou shalt do reverence to the Lord thy God,
9 and him only shalt thou serve.' And he brought him to Jerusalem, and set him upon the pinnacle of the temple, and said unto
him, 'If thou be the Son of God, throw thyself down from here;
10 for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee,
11 to keep thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at
12 any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.' And Jesus answered
and said unto him, 'It is said, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy
13 God.' And when the Devil had finished every temptation, he
departed from him for a season.

1. The inspiration of Jesus is pressed; *cp.* also verse 14. Doubtless this vague and yet significant word 'inspiration' best hits off the peculiarity of Jesus's teaching. Like Amos and Isaiah at their best, he was an inspired teacher, and his audience was

not slow to note and mark the difference between him and the ordinary teachers and preachers of his age. His teaching had those notes of originality, independence and fervour about it which both then and now men rightly called and call inspiration.

3. The order of the temptations is changed in Luke, as the reader will notice for himself, together with other smaller deviations and changes.

13. He left him 'for a season.' The allusion is to the final temptations in chapter xxii.

14–30. Jesus in Nazareth

(*Cp.* Mark i. 14, 15, vi. 1–6; Matt. iv. 12–17, xiii. 53–58)

14 And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee:
and the report of him spread through all the region round about.
15 And he taught in their synagogues, and was praised by all.

16 And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up:
and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath
17 day, and stood up to read. And there was delivered unto him the
book of the prophet Isaiah. And when he unrolled the book, he
18 found a place where was written: 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon
me, because he hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the
poor; he hath sent me to proclaim deliverance to the captives, and
recovery of sight to the blind, to send away the crushed in liberty,
19, 20 to proclaim an acceptable year of the Lord.' And he folded the
book, and he gave it again to the attendant, and sat down. And
the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on
him.

21 And he began to say unto them, 'To-day this scripture which
22 your ears have heard hath been fulfilled.' And all bore him
witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out
23 of his mouth. And they said, 'Is not this Joseph's son?' And he
said unto them, 'Ye will surely say unto me this proverb,
Physician, heal thyself: all that we have heard was done in
24 Capernaum, do also here in thine own country.' And he said,
'Verily I say unto you, No prophet is acceptable in his own
25 country. I tell you of a truth, there were many widows in Israel
in the days of Elijah, when the heaven was shut up three years

and six months, and a great famine was throughout all the land;
26 and unto none of them was Elijah sent, but only to Sarepta in the
27 land of Sidon, unto a heathen. And there were many lepers in
Israel in the time of Elisha the prophet; and none of them was
28 cleansed, but only Naaman the Syrian.' And all they in the
synagogue, when they heard these words, were filled with wrath.
29 And they rose up, and thrust him out of the city, and led him
unto the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they
30 might cast him down headlong. But he passed through the midst
of them and went his way.

Luke now makes a great change from the order of Mark. Though B. Weiss supposes that in doing this he followed his extra special authority (L), it is more probable that the transposition of the rejection in Nazareth to this place, and the variants in, and additions to, the story are entirely the work of the Evangelist. His aim is to symbolize the rejection of the gospel and the Christ by the Jews, and their acceptance by the Gentiles. The miracles which Jesus is said to work outside Nazareth represent the diffusion of the gospel beyond Israel. The widow of Sarepta and Naaman are types of Christians who were once heathen. 'Ainsi comprise, la scène de Nazareth éclaire la suite de l'Évangile et fait entrevoir l'avenir de la divine parole, l'incrédulité des Juifs et leur réprobation, la volonté qu'ils ont eue de tuer Jésus, qui vit toujours, et d'étouffer l'Évangile, qui se répand dans tout l'univers. Tout ce que Luc racontera dans ses deux livres est condensé en cet unique tableau' (*E. S.* I. p. 839). Rightly then does it prelude the long story of the Gospel and the Acts.

14, 15 correspond with Mark i. 14, 15, but the content of Jesus's teaching, as summed up in Mark, is omitted, for another and very different opening is given in iv. 21. 'Jesus eröffnet seine Predigt damit, dass er sich sofort selber zum Objekt macht; ich bin der mit dem Geist des Herrn Gesalbte, den der Prophet meint. Er weissagt nicht das Bevorstehen des Reiches Gottes, sondern er sagt: das Jahr der Gnade ist jetzt mit dem Beginn meines Wirkens eingetreten. Er ruft nicht zur Busse auf, sondern bringt den Armen das Heil und die Erlösung' (W.). The reputation won by Jesus is added, somewhat prematurely, in order to justify 23.

16. Luke wants to make the story of Jesus's teaching begin in Nazareth, his true birthplace. Hence he has to place the 'rejection' narrated in Mark vi. at the very opening of the

ministry. The reason why Luke desired to make Jesus begin at Nazareth was not that he thought it only natural that this should have been the case, but that the rejection in his own city typifies and prefigures his rejection by his own country. Nazareth anticipates Jerusalem.

Awkward changes are necessitated by putting the story thus early.

17–21. Luke only.

17. The reading from the prophets occurs in Luke only. For the custom alluded to and for its history, see Additional Note 52.

'His custom' is to attend synagogue, not to 'read' there in public. The S.S. seems to have a better order. There Jesus is given the book and he stands up to read. He does not propose himself.

Commentators are divided as to whether we are to understand that Jesus opened the roll by chance (or by divine control) at this passage, or whether he deliberately and intentionally chose it. To my mind the second alternative is the better. Here Jesus proclaims his mission. He is not (according to Luke) the 'political' Messiah; he is no warrior king and deliverer. He is the servant of God whose mission it is to bring to the poor and the afflicted spiritual enlightenment and salvation. The quotation is from Isaiah lxi. 1, 2, with a clause added from lviii. 6. Luke chose the passage from Isaiah because he saw in it the best representation of Jesus's Messianic mission. The year of grace may be intended to refer to the year (in duration) of Jesus's own ministry.

20. The custom apparently was to read standing up, but to preach, or comment upon the passage read, sitting down.

21. Luke gives the substance of what one has to suppose that Jesus said. He had no report of it, and was not interested to supply it in detail himself. The important point to him is what followed. The narrative in Mark is partly followed, partly changed.

22. The audience is not only said to be astonished as in Mark, but even delighted. They admire the beauty of his words. Luke wants the men of Nazareth to acknowledge Jesus's eloquence and charm, and yet to reject him all the same. He does this very awkwardly. Indeed, if Jesus had really preached what Luke tells us, they would have been rather struck, as Loisy says, by his pretensions than by his charm.

'They all bore him witness': *i.e.* they bore witness in his favour: they openly recognized and admitted his excellence. We must assume that the men of Nazareth are compelled to recognize the power and beauty of the teaching and personality, but no sooner do they feel this than they react and rebel against the feeling. They attempt to get rid of the new comer and his new teaching by a reference to his ancestry. The carpenter's son, the son of Joseph, our neighbour, whom we all know, can after all have nothing fresh or true to tell us.

'Is not this Joseph's son?' The words are curious. *Cp.* Mark vi. 3 where we find, 'Is he not the carpenter, the son of Mary, the brother of James and Joses and Juda and Simon? and are not his sisters here with us?' and Matt. xiii. 55 where we read, 'Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary, and his brothers James and Joseph and Simon and Judas? And are not also his sisters all with us?' The omission of any reference to Jesus's mother and brothers and sisters in Luke may be due to a desire to avoid mentioning them in a connection where it would have to be inferred that they were people whose relative one would not expect to speak with such convincing grace and power.

Spitta sees in the words, 'Is not this Joseph's son?' the most original text. They are evidence that Luke, here as often elsewhere, knew and used the oldest and most original version of the Gospel story: the apostolic 'Grundschrift,' as Spitta is wont to call it. Luke can, and often does, get behind Mark. In direct conflict with this view Loisy thinks that the words are used with deliberate artistic artifice by Luke. To the townsmen of Nazareth Jesus is indeed Joseph's son. *They* knew no better. This seems rather doubtful.

23. This verse has to be put in by Luke on account of his placing the story of the rejection at the opening of the ministry. Jesus, as it were, predicts that the rejection will happen, although it is happening now. The story is predicted and yet anticipated, a most curious combination. It also has to imply that Jesus had already performed many miracles in Capernaum, an implication which verses 14 and 15 had hardly indicated.

'Heal thyself.' What does this mean here? (1) Show us, your fellow citizens, miracles before we can credit those you have done elsewhere, or (2) make us, who know you and are incredulous, believe in you first, before you try to become, and to be acknowledged as, the healer of all Israel and the servant of God. The second interpretation is the more probable. Instead of saying that Jesus could do no miracles at Nazareth because of the unbelief of his fellow citizens, Luke makes them demand miracles beforehand. At least this is what Jesus assumes that they are going to say.

The symbolism of the narrative explains the peculiarity of its construction. The men of Nazareth represent the Jews who want signs and miracles, but are not worthy to have them. The Gentiles, typified by the widow and by Naaman, receive and believe in Jesus; the Jews, typified by the men of Nazareth, reject him. The proverb, as here used, reveals, according to Harnack, Luke the physician.

24. Luke now again quotes Mark, indicating, as Loisy says, his return to his source by a fresh 'And he said.' Yet it must be confessed that the saying is here out of place, and what follows illustrates the previous verse rather than this one. But what we have to think of is not so much the reception afforded to Jesus at Nazareth as the attitude of the Jews towards Christ and Christianity (*E. S.* I. p. 847).

25–30. Luke only.

In 25–27 Jesus makes his rejection by Nazareth typify his rejection by the Jews. As in old days it was Jews who were rejected, and Gentiles who were chosen, so shall it be again.

26. The text has here at the end of the verse *χήραν*, 'a widow.' But the sense is immensely improved if, with W., we read 'Aramæan' for 'widow.' 'Aramæan' would in Aramaic differ from 'widow' by one letter only. Hence the Greek misrendering. 'Aramæan' would not have here a national, but a religious, signification. It equals 'heathen,' as in 27 also. The examples given do not effectually illustrate either 23 or 24. Elijah was not specially honoured in Sarepta or Elisha despised in Israel. The examples are merely chosen for the symbolism. As these prophets went outside Israel, so will Jesus go, so will the gospel.

As Holtzmann rightly says, the words are in Jesus's mouth at this juncture impossible. *Cp.* Matt. x. 5, 6.

28–30. This exaggerated wrath and the attempt to murder are clearly unhistorical. But in the form which it is made to wear the rejection at Nazareth provides a suitable introductory story for the whole life and mission. The rejection of the Jews, their hatred and hostility, the call of the heathen, are all indicated and anticipated.

In spite of the desire of the Jews to murder him, Jesus walks without harm away from them. 'C'est la puissance divine, et non la majesté de Jésus, qui contient les Nazaréens' (*E. S.* I. 849, n. 2). The story ends with a manifestation of the divine power, which is much more extraordinary than the healings.

31–37. THE UNCLEAN SPIRIT IN THE SYNAGOGUE AT CAPERNAUM

(*Cp.* Mark i. 21–28)

31 And he came to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and taught
32 them on the sabbath day. And they were amazed at his teaching,
for his speech was with power.

33 And in the synagogue there was a man, who had a spirit of an
34 unclean demon, and he cried out with a loud voice, saying, 'Ha!
what have we to do with thee, Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come
to destroy us? I know thee who thou art; the Holy One of God.'
35 And Jesus rebuked it, saying, 'Hold thy peace, and come out of
him.' And the demon threw him down in the midst of them, and
36 came out of him, without hurting him. And wonder fell upon
them all, and they spoke among themselves, saying, 'What is this
word? for with authority and power he commands the unclean
37 spirits, and they come out.' And the report of him went out into
every place of the country round about.

Luke now returns to Mark's first chapter, but he passes over Mark i. 16–20, which he does not give till v. He wants to bring Jesus now at once to Capernaum, and so postpones the call of the first disciples.

The variations from Mark are not important.

33. 'A spirit of an unclean demon.' The spirit consisted of a demon.

35. Luke adds: 'without hurting him.' The marvel is heightened.

38, 39. PETER'S MOTHER-IN-LAW

(*Cp.* Mark i. 29–31; Matt. viii. 14, 15)

38 And he arose and went out of the synagogue, and entered into
the house of Simon. And Simon's wife's mother was suffering
39 with a great fever; and they besought him concerning her. And
he stood over her, and rebuked the fever; and it left her: and
immediately she arose and waited on them.

38. Simon is introduced quite suddenly, as a known character. The reason is that Luke really follows Mark i. 29, though he transposes the 'call' of Simon to the next chapter.

39. The miracle is heightened. Jesus does not touch the woman's hand. He 'rebukes' the fever as if it were a demon.

40–44. MANY HEALINGS—JESUS LEAVES THE CITY

(*Cp.* Mark i. 32–39; Matt. viii. 16–17, iv. 23–25)

40 Now when the sun was setting, all they that had any sick with
divers diseases brought them unto him; and he laid his hands on
41 each of them, and healed them. And demons also came out of
many, crying out, and saying, 'Thou art the Son of God.' And he
rebuked them, and permitted them not to speak: for they knew
that he was the Messiah.

42 And when it was day, he left the house and went to a lonely
place: and the crowds sought him, and came unto him, and tried
43 to keep him so that he should not leave them. But he said unto
them, 'I must preach the good tidings of the kingdom of God to
44 other cities also: because for this I was sent.' And he went about
preaching in the synagogues of Judæa.

40. The 'laying on of hands' is added. Luke seems rather to believe in its special magical power. *Cp.* Acts viii. 17. Anything connected with healing interests him specially. To him, says Harnack, Jesus is pre-eminently the Healer. Moreover 'Doctor' Luke is careful, as here, to distinguish between natural illnesses and demoniac possessions. *Cp.* vi. 18, vii. 21, xiii. 32.

43. Note the phrase, 'I must preach the good tidings of the kingdom of God.' *εὐαγγελίσασθαί με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ.* The content of the Gospel is the kingdom. It is imminent and at hand. Luke's 'I was sent' (*i.e.* from God) is a grandiose and inaccurate interpretation of Mark's 'I came forth' (from the city).

44. 'He went about preaching in the synagogues of Judæa.' It is usually said that 'Judæa' (which is the better attested reading here) includes Galilee. Or again it is held that Judæa means Palestine. (So Loisy, *E. S.* I. p. 162, n. 2.) But Spitta seeks to argue that in the apostolic 'Grundschrift,' which Luke here follows, Jesus left Galilee, and went to preach his gospel in Judæa. It is in Judæa that he stays up to at least vii. 35. I am unable to enter into a discussion of this theory; Spitta's essay is well worth reading. See 'Die geographische Disposition des Lebens Jesu nach den Synoptikern,' in *Streitfragen der Geschichte Jesu* (1907), pp. 14–20.

CHAPTER V

1-11. THE CALL OF PETER

(*Cp.* Mark i. 16-20; Matt. iv. 18-22)

1 And it came to pass, that, as the people pressed upon him, hearkening to the word of God, he stood by the lake of Gennesaret,
2 and he saw two boats lying by the lake: but the fishermen had
3 gone out of them, and were washing their nets. And he went on to one of the boats, which was Simon's, and asked him to put out a little from the land. And he sat down, and taught the people
4 from the boat. Now when he ceased speaking, he said unto Simon, 'Put out into the deep water, and let down your nets for
5 a catch.' And Simon answered and said unto him, 'Master, we have toiled all the night, and have caught nothing: nevertheless
6 at thy word I will let down the nets.' And when they had done this, they inclosed a large number of fish: and their nets began to
7 break. And they beckoned unto their companions who were in the other boat to come and help them. And they came, and filled
8 both the boats, so that they began to sink. When Simon Peter saw it, he fell down at Jesus's knees, saying, 'Depart from me; for
9 I am a sinful man, O Lord.' For amazement seized him and all that were with him, at the catch of fish which they had taken:
10 and so too it was with James and John, the sons of Zebedee, who were partners with Simon. And Jesus said unto Simon, 'Fear
11 not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men.' And when they had brought their boats to land, they abandoned everything, and followed him.

This passage is Luke's substitution for the simpler story in Mark. The fishing has already become half allegorical. The fish in the deep sea are the heathen, who are to be caught in masses by the teaching of Jesus and his disciples. Whether Luke has himself composed the story or not is disputed. Perhaps he has adapted it from quite a different environment. So Loisy, who thinks the original story was connected with an apparition of the risen Jesus by the lake. *Cp.* John xxi. 1–14. The breaking of the net must not be allegorically pressed, but Peter's remark as to the failure of his previous attempts probably alludes to the lack of success of the apostolic preaching among the Jews, and to his own hesitation, at the first, to the diffusion of the gospel among the Gentiles (Acts xi. 1–18) (*E. S.* I. pp. 440–446). As Luke has no Galilæan apparitions of the risen Christ, he could only use this story, Loisy thinks, by changing its character and its date. As to the source from which Luke took the story, it is to B. Weiss his 'Sonderquelle,' L; to Loisy it is, perhaps, 'le document fondamental de Marc' (*E. S.* I. p. 147). 'It is not too rash to suppose that the apparition on the lake was the vision of Peter, the first apparition of the risen Christ according to the tradition followed by Paul, and that it belonged to the tradition of Mark concerning the resurrection' (*E. S.* I. p. 444).

8. Peter as a sinful man is afraid of the near presence of the 'man of God' and his miracles. This is quite in accordance with Old Testament precedents and ideas. *Cp.* Judges vi. 22; Isaiah vi. 5; and also 1 Kings xvii. 18.

10. The words of Jesus, in Mark, addressed to Simon and Andrew, are in Luke addressed to Simon only. He represents the apostles as a whole.

12–16. HEALING OF A LEPER

(*Cp.* Mark i. 40–45; Matt. viii. 1–4)

12 And it came to pass, when he was in one of the cities, behold
a man full of leprosy: who seeing Jesus fell on his face, and
besought him, saying, 'Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me
13 clean.' And he stretched out his hand, and touched him, saying,
'I will: be thou cleansed.' And immediately the leprosy departed
14 from him. And he bade him tell no man: 'but go, and show
thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing, according as
15 Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.' But the report of
him spread the more: and great crowds came together to hear
16 him, and to be healed of their sicknesses. But he withdrew
himself into lonely places, and prayed.

Mark's narrative is closely followed.

17–26. Healing of a Paralyzed Man

(*Cp.* Mark ii. 1–12; Matt. ix. 1–8)

17 And it came to pass, one day, as he was teaching, that there
were Pharisees and teachers of the Law sitting by, who were come
out of every village of Galilee, and Judæa, and Jerusalem: and the
18 power of the Lord was there so that he should heal. And, behold,
men brought on a bed a man who was paralyzed; and they tried
19 to bring him in, and to place him before him. And when, on
account of the crowd, they could find no way by which they could
bring him in, they went up on to the roof, and let him down
20 through the tiles with his bed into the midst before Jesus. And
when he saw their faith, he said unto him, 'Man, thy sins are
21 forgiven thee.' And the scribes and the Pharisees began to argue,
saying, 'Who is this man who speaks blasphemies? Who can
22 forgive sins, but God alone?' But when Jesus perceived their
thoughts, he answered and said unto them, 'What do ye argue in
23 your hearts? Which is easier: to say, Thy sins are forgiven thee;
24 or to say, Rise up and walk? But that ye may know that the
Son of man hath power upon earth to forgive sins,' (he said unto
the paralyzed man,) 'I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy bed,
25 and go home.' And immediately he rose up before them, and
took up that whereon he lay, and departed to his home, glorifying
26 God. And utter amazement seized them all, and they glorified
God, and were filled with fear, saying, 'We have seen marvellous
things to-day.'

Luke brings in the Pharisees and legal doctors from the first. W. follows the S.S. and reads 'and' for 'who,' *i.e.* 'and people were come from every village of Galilee.' He then supposes that 'Judæa and Jerusalem' are an unsuitable, added insertion. Spitta, on the other hand, who thinks the scene is laid in Judæa, holds, on the contrary, that it is the words 'village of Galilee' which were added by the Evangelist, and that the 'Grundschrift' read 'who had come from all Judah and Jerusalem.' *Cp. loc. cit.* p. 25. He supposes that v. 1–16 is an insertion of the Evangelist, which does not really belong here.

17. 'The power of the Lord.' The expression is peculiar. Luke supposes that a certain inrush of the spirit gave Jesus the power to heal, and drove him to its exercise. The literal transla-

tion, as given by Plummer, is 'the power of the Lord was (present) for him to heal (with).' But Luke probably meant: 'the power of the Lord was upon him,' and urged him to do some healing work as well as gave him the capacity to do it. Some MSS. read *αὐτούς* for *αὐτόν*: *i.e.* the power of the Lord was upon him to heal them. So W.

27–32. CALL OF LEVI

(*Cp.* Mark ii. 13–17; Matt. ix. 9–13)

27 And after this he went forth, and saw a tax-collector, named
Levi, sitting at the tax-house; and he said unto him, 'Follow me.'
28 And he left all, rose up, and followed him.
29 And Levi made him a great banquet in his house: and there
was a great company of tax-collectors and of others that sat down
30 with them to table. But their scribes and Pharisees murmured
against his disciples, saying, 'Why do ye eat and drink with tax-
31 collectors and sinners?' And Jesus answered and said unto them,
'The healthy have no need of a physician; but they that are sick.
32 I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.'

32. The meaning of 'call' is perhaps slightly narrowed by the addition of 'to repentance.'

33–39. FASTING

(*Cp.* Mark ii. 18–22; Matt. ix. 14–17)

33 And they said unto him, 'The disciples of John fast often, and
offer prayers, [and so too the disciples of the Pharisees;] but thine
34 eat and drink.' And he said unto them, 'Can ye make the
35 wedding guests fast, while the bridegroom is with them? But the
days will come, when the bridegroom will be taken away from
them, and then they will fast in those days.'
36 And he spoke also a parable unto them: 'No man teareth
a piece from a new garment and putteth it upon an old one;
for, if he do, he both will tear the new, and the patch from the
37 new will not match with the old. And no man poureth new wine
into old wineskins; for, if he do, the new wine will burst the

38 skins, and it will be spilled, and the skins will perish. But new
39 wine must be poured into new skins. And no man having drunk
old wine desireth new: for he saith, The old is good.'

33. In Luke attention is also called to the fact that the disciples of John have and use [special] prayers. But in the rest of the passage no further allusion is made to prayers. *Cp.*, however, xi. 1, where the matter is taken up again.

36. The wording of this important and difficult saying is different in Luke. The 'piece of (new) undressed cloth' becomes 'a piece from a new garment.' Either the change is due to the odd custom alluded to in Mark being unintelligible to Luke, though his own amendment suggests an act of extraordinary folly, or the 'new garment' implies the already independent and separately constituted Christian community. The thirty-ninth verse is a peculiar addition of Luke, wanting in the MS. D. It seems, taken in conjunction with what precedes, to imply that the disciples of John may justifiably continue in their ancient practices, while the disciples of Jesus must not imitate them. The old cannot be patched up by a few new trimmings: the new is only distorted and spoiled by adoptions and borrowings from the old. Professor Pfleiderer thinks the verse is due to a mere 'loose association of ideas,' but in that case it becomes wholly devoid of applied meaning.

How long did the disciples of John preserve an independent existence? Or do they typify the Jewish Christians, as opposed to the heathen Christians? Let the former practise old customs still; but let the latter not imitate them. Dr Carpenter explains 39 differently, but I hardly fancy that his explanation can be correct. 'The love of ancient order was not only intelligible, it deserved a reverent regard; and a tender little apology for those who could not at once accept the full consequences of larger principles belongs to this gospel only' (*First Three Gospels*, p. 267). Or is the meaning of the verse as is suggested by Loisy merely to state, but not to explain (or justify) the attitude of the Jews towards the Gospel?

CHAPTER VI

1–11. THE SABBATH

(*Cp.* Mark ii. 23–28, iii. 1–6; Matt. xii. 1–14)

1 And it came to pass on a sabbath day that he went through
some corn fields; and his disciples plucked the ears of corn, and
2 ate them, rubbing them in their hands. And some of the Pharisees
said, 'Why do ye what is not permitted on the sabbath day?'
3 And Jesus answered and said unto them, 'Have ye not read even
that which David did, when he and they who were with him were
4 hungry? How he went into the house of God, and took and ate
the shewbread, and gave it also to them that were with him;
which is not permitted for any to eat except the priests alone?'
5 And he said unto them, 'The Son of man is lord also of the
sabbath.'

6 And it came to pass also on another sabbath, that he entered
into the synagogue and taught: and a man was there whose right
7 hand was withered. And the scribes and Pharisees kept watching
him to see whether he would heal on the sabbath day; that they
8 might find an accusation against him. But he knew their thoughts,
and said to the man who had the withered hand, 'Rise up, and
9 stand forward.' And he arose and stood forward. Then said
Jesus unto them, 'I ask you: Is it permitted to do good on the
sabbath day rather than to do evil? to save life rather than to
10 destroy it?' And looking round on them all, he said unto the
man, 'Stretch out thy hand.' And he did so: and his hand was
11 restored. And they were filled with frenzy; and they discussed
with one another what they should do to Jesus.

3. 'Have ye not read even that' is an awkward and unlikely phrase. Better to follow D, which adopts Mark's 'never.'

5. This verse corresponds with Mark ii. 28, but the explanatory verse 27 is wanting in Luke. Without it the words, 'the Son of man is lord even (or, also) of the Sabbath,' occur very abruptly; the *καί* ('even' or 'also'), omitted by some MSS., becomes also rather more difficult. The omission by Luke of Mark ii. 27 is used by some in support of the theory that 'Son of man' in Jesus's mouth meant 'man' generically, and did not mean '*The* Man,' the Messiah. For to Luke the term meant undoubtedly the Messiah; hence Mark ii. 27 could not be for him the proof of his verse 5. For Mark ii. 27 only supports 28 if in that verse Son of man means 'man.' Therefore Luke omits it.

The MS. D puts 5 after 10: after 4 it possesses a remarkable and most interesting addition of its own, as follows: 'On the same day he saw a man working on the Sabbath, and he said to him: Man, if thou knowest what thou art doing, thou art blessed (*μακάριος*); but if thou knowest not, thou art accursed and a transgressor of the law.' The saying is in all probability not authentic. It is for one thing too subtle and Pauline (*cp.* Romans xiv. 14, 20-23), and secondly it is highly doubtful whether Jesus would have gone so far in open approval of a direct violation of one of the most fundamental injunctions of the Law, of an avowed violation of one of the Ten Commandments.

9. For Mark's *ἀποκτεῖναι* Luke has *ἀπολέσαι*. For a subtle, but surely over subtle, explanation of the reason of the change, it is really worth while for a student to look at B. Weiss, *Quellen*, A, p. 25.

12-19. ELECTION OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES—MANY HEALINGS

(*Cp.* Mark iii. 13-19, 7-12; Matt. x. 2-4, xii. 15-21)

12 And it came to pass in those days, that he went out on to the mountain to pray, and he passed the whole night in prayer
13 to God. And when it was day, he called unto him his disciples: and from them he chose out twelve, whom he also called apostles;
14 Simon, (whom he also named Peter,) and Andrew his brother,
15 James and John, Philip and Bartholomew, Matthew and Thomas,
16 James the son of Alphæus, and Simon called the Zealot, and Judas the son of James, and Judas Iscariot, who became the betrayer.

17 And he came down with them, and stood on a level place, together with a large crowd of his disciples, and a great multitude of people from all Judæa and Jerusalem, and from the sea coast

of Tyre and Sidon, who came to hear him, and to be healed of
18 their diseases; and they that were troubled with unclean spirits
19 were cured. And all the crowd sought to touch him: for a power
went out from him, and healed them all.

Two paragraphs in Mark are now given in inverse order. Luke desires to give greater prominence to the call of the Twelve. Jesus selects them from his disciples, and thus distinguishes between the chosen Twelve and the general body of disciples. Jesus passes the whole night in prayer before he makes his choice. Having selected the Twelve, he descends into the plain, where he can more properly address the multitude. Thus Luke deliberately changes the *locale* of the 'Sermon on the Mount,' and with good reason. A plain rather than a mountain is suited for a speech which is not merely addressed to a small body of disciples. Both B. and J. Weiss try to avoid this conclusion. The latter says: 'in Luke too the Sermon is spoken upon a mountain; only Luke rather pedantically points out that it was not spoken from the summit, where there would be no room for many people, but from a flat place, a little way down' (*eine Art Matte*). Can the words bear this sense? So too B. Weiss, *Quellen*, B, p. 111.

16. 'Judas [the son] of James' stands in the place of Mark's Thaddæus and Matthew's Lebbæus.

17. D omits 'and Jerusalem,' probably rightly. Here again Spitta takes the words literally. Judæa means Judæa, and not Palestine. Jesus is still in Judæa. But then the words 'and from the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon' become very strange. It cannot be said that Spitta's explanation of them is at all likely. (See the essay 'Die geographische Disposition,' &c. pp. 32, 33.)

19. For Luke's phraseology *cp.* Mark v. 30.

20–49. The Sermon in the Plain.

Matthew's Sermon on the Mount is far longer than Luke's Sermon in the Plain: parallels to some passages in Matthew occur in Luke elsewhere. Only three or four verses in Luke do not find a parallel in Matthew. Luke seems to have known and used an earlier version of the common material than was used by Matthew. But bits of Luke's Sermon no less than bits of Matthew's seem to posit a date later than Jesus, when the Christian community was already in existence, and when trouble and persecution had begun.

It is usually suggested that Luke omits the passages dealing with supposed Rabbinic teaching and the relation of Jesus to the Law as of no interest to his Gentile readers. It does not follow, because Luke may have used an earlier version of the common material, that therefore he always preserves the better or earlier readings. On the contrary, Matthew often seems to have the better and earlier readings.

The parallels between Luke and Matthew may be summarised thus:

Luke vi. 20–23 = Matthew v. 1, 3, 5, 6, 10–12.
„ 24–26 not in Matthew.
„ 27, 28 = Matthew v. 44.
„ 29, 30 = „ v. 39, 40, 42.
„ 31 = „ vii. 12.
„ 32, 33 = „ v. 46, 47.
„ 34, 35 not in Matthew.
„ 36 = Matthew v. 48.
„ 37, 38 = „ vii. 1–2.
„ 39, 40 not in Matthew, but *cp.* Matthew xv. 14, x. 24.
„ 41, 42 = Matthew vii. 3–5.
„ 43, 44 = „ vii. 18–20.
„ 45 not in Matthew, but *cp.* Matthew xii. 34, 35.
„ 46 not in Matthew (*cp.* vii. 21).
„ 47–49 = Matthew vii. 24–27.

20–26. The Beatitudes and the Woes

(*Cp.* Matt. v. 1–12)

20 And he lifted up his eyes upon his disciples, and said, ‘Happy
21 are ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God. Happy are ye
that hunger now: for ye shall be satisfied. Happy are ye that
22 weep now: for ye shall laugh. Happy are ye, when men shall
hate you, and expel you, and revile you, and reject your name
23 as evil, for the Son of man’s sake. Rejoice in that day, and leap
for joy: for, behold, your reward is great in heaven: for in the
same manner acted their fathers unto the prophets.

24 ‘But woe unto you that are rich, for ye have received your
25 consolation. Woe unto you that are now satisfied, for ye shall
hunger. Woe unto you that laugh now, for ye shall mourn and
26 weep. Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you, for
so did their fathers unto the false prophets.

20–23. The beatitudes in Luke are shorter and fewer than those in Matthew. The first two might well have been uttered by Jesus with his special sympathy for the poor and the afflicted. The point of view is precisely the same as that of the Psalmist. The rich and bad have their own way in this world: the poor and righteous shall have their own way in the next. The identification of the poor with the righteous, of the wicked with the rich, is too simple and sweeping for our more developed and impartial judgment. Even Matthew felt the difficulty, and sought to turn the original poverty in this world's goods and advantages into a sort of spiritual humility. B. Weiss's view is peculiar. He regards the original beatitudes of Jesus and of Q as consisting of Matt. v. 3, 4, 6. To these Matthew added 5, 7, 8 and 9. The verses 3, 4 and 6 tell of the spiritual qualities which make men capable of receiving the Kingdom and its spiritual good. Matthew's additions speak of qualities which can be attained in this life, and which make those who have attained them certain to obtain the salvation of the next world. Though Weiss says it is difficult to understand that the totally different character of 3, 4 and 6 from 5, 7, 8, 9 is not generally acknowledged, few will be found to agree with him. However this may be, he is keen to argue that Matthew's form of 3 and 4 and 6 is original, and not Luke's; Luke's form is not even intended to be an authentic reproduction of Jesus's words (how can Weiss know Luke's intention ?), but gives an application of them to the circumstances of the time, when the Christian community in Judæa consisted of poor and hungry folk who mourned their comfortless condition (*Quellen*, A, p. 257). As Weiss thinks that Luke's Sermon is largely taken, not from Q but from L, the date of L could not in that case be very early.

22, 23. The early Christians are being persecuted by the Jews, but in view of the recompense in heaven which awaits them (at once after death, or at the Resurrection ?), they are to rejoice in their misfortunes. For 'Son of man' in 22 Matthew (v. 11) has simply 'me.' A significant fact.

'Reject, or, cast out your name as evil' seems to mean: 'speak evil of, and revile, the name ye bear' (*i.e.* the name 'Christian').

24–26. The three 'woes,' antitheses to the beatitudes, are wanting in Matthew. They sound somewhat mechanical and late. B. Weiss, who regards them as the creation of L, compares James v. 1–4. To address the absent rich in the second person seems artificial. The 'woes' were easily constructed with the beatitudes as basis and contrast. Are the 'rich' bad people Scribes and Pharisees ? This is commonly assumed, but is doubtful. For then a very early date for these verses must be assumed, which as they only occur in Luke, is surely unlikely. Doubtless the Christian community still mainly consisted of poor, humble, unimportant folk. But that there were, after the fall of the Temple, many rich Pharisees is hard to believe. Loisy thinks that those menaced are not the persecutors of the Church, but 'les gens du monde' and those Christians who imitated them. On the whole he thinks it probable that even if Luke took the idea of these maledictions from tradition, 'il n'a pas eu besoin de les trouver toutes faites, et il a très bien pu les rédiger lui-même' (*E. S.* II. pp. 553, 554).

27–36. THE LOVE OF ENEMIES

(*Cp.* Matt. v. 39–42, 44–48, vii. 12)

27 'But I say unto you who hear, Love your enemies, do good to
28 them who hate you, bless them that curse you, and pray for them
29 who illtreat you. And unto him that smiteth thee on the one
cheek offer also the other; and from him that taketh away thy
30 cloak refuse not thy coat also. Give to every man that asketh of
thee; and from him that taketh away thy goods ask them not
31 again. And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also
32 to them likewise. For if ye love them who love you, what favour
33 have ye? for even sinners love those that love them. And if
ye do good to them who do good to you, what favour have ye?
34 even sinners do the same. And if ye lend to them from whom
ye hope to receive, what favour have ye? even sinners also lend
35 to sinners, to receive as much again. But love ye your enemies,
and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing in return; and your
reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Most
36 High: for he is good unto the ungrateful and the evil. Be ye
therefore pitiful, even as your Father is pitiful.

From 27 to 45 the Sermon speaks, according to Dr Plummer, 'of the duties to be performed by those who are admitted to the Kingdom. This forms the main body of the discourse. Luke omits the greater portion of what is reported in Matthew respecting Christ's relation to the Mosaic Law, and his condemnation of existing methods of interpreting it and of fulfilling it. This discussion of Judaic principles and practices would not have much meaning for Luke's Gentile readers. The portion of it which he gives is stated without reference to Judaism. The main point in Matthew is the contrast between legal righteousness and true righteousness. In Luke the main point is that true righteousness is love; but the opposition between formalism and the spirit of love is not urged. The opposition which is here marked is the more universal opposition between the spirit of selfishness and the spirit of love.'

The rich and careless have been disposed of. The Sermon now returns to the disciples and to those who accept the burden and duties of the Christian name. The hardest duty of all is put in the forefront and beginning. The evil they endure from others is not to be returned, but on the contrary good is to be rendered for evil. And this, not merely or mainly, as it would seem, for the enemies' sake, but for themselves. In order to reap the heavenly reward, they must entirely forego all human reward. God's thanks are reserved for those who neither seek nor obtain the thanks of man. At the same time one cannot help feeling a certain dissonance in the idealism of 27 *seq.* preceded by the contemptuous denunciations of 24–26. How far did the disciples of Jesus ever seek to love their enemies, for example, the Jews? The whole history of Christianity supplies the answer. The lofty demands of Jesus have been always and conspicuously violated. The very author or compiler of 24–26 and 27 *seq.* did not perceive the dissonance between them. Did even Jesus show or feel a yearning pity for those 'rich' who, on his own showing, so greatly required it? Would he have mourned their destruction and hastened to prevent it? If God, as he says in 35, be really good to the wicked, how can they be permanently excluded from the Kingdom of heaven, how can it be right to point at them the finger of scorn, to predict with complacency their time of mourning and tears, to call them vipers and children of hell? Human nature is inconsistent and frail, and Jesus was not exempt from frailty and inconsistency, Even for him it was not easy to practise what he taught, or to see the mote in his own eye while he chastised the beam in another's.

27, 28. The nobility of these lofty injunctions cannot be ignored. They are more detailed and expressive than their parallel, Matt. v. 43, 44.

29 uses Matt. v. 39, 40 under the point of view of 'love your enemies.' 29 *a* is more in place in Matthew than here. 'So treffend es den Gegensatz gegen alles Widerstandleisten ausdrückt...so sieht man nicht welche Wohltat man dem Feinde damit erweist, dass man ihm die andere Wange zum Schlagen darbietet' (Weiss, *Quellen*, A, p. 259). Instead of a law-suit about the clothes, Luke supposes a robber. There is to be no resistance, even though the enemy seeks to take coat as well as cloak. In 30 the same injunction is repeated in a generalized form.

Professor Pfleiderer seems to me quite right when he says of these verses that it is honestly impossible to deny that their commands are 'not practicable in any society, because they would destroy all law and order, and give free play to brute force. They are only to be understood from the feelings of a time when the world seemed about to dissolve, and all social institutions to be annihilated by the fire of the last Judgment. Only under such circumstances could it seem proper wholly to abandon one's own rights, and to show complete indifference to honour and shame in this world in order to receive for oneself the glories of the world to come' (*Die Entstehung des Christentums*, p. 87, 1905). The usual interpretation of the paradoxes of the Sermon in the Plain or on the Mount may be most clearly and forcibly given in the words of Dr Plummer. The doctrine is excellent: how far it fully does justice to the Sermon is more doubtful. 'The four precepts here given are startling. It is impossible for either governments or individuals to keep them. A state which endeavoured to shape its policy in exact accordance with them would soon cease to exist; and if individuals acted in strict obedience to them society would be reduced to anarchy. Violence, robbery, and shameless exaction would be supreme. The inference is that *they are not precepts, but illustrations of principles.* They are in the form of rules; but as they *cannot* be kept as rules, we are *compelled* to look beyond the letter to the spirit which they embody. If Christ had given precepts which could be kept literally, we might easily have rested content with observing the letter, and have never penetrated to the spirit. What is the spirit? Amongst other things this: that resistance of evil and refusal to part with our property must never be a *personal* matter: so far as we are concerned we must be willing to suffer still more and to surrender still more. It is right to withstand and even to punish those who injure us: but in order to correct them and protect society; not because of any personal *animus.* It is right also to withhold our possessions from those who without good reason ask for them: but in order to check idleness and effrontery; not because we are too fond of our possessions to part with them. *So far as our personal feeling goes,* we ought to be ready to offer the other cheek, and to give, without desire of recovery, whatever is demanded or taken from us. Love knows no limits but those which love itself imposes. When love resists or refuses, it is because compliance would be a violation of love, not because it would involve loss or suffering.'

31. The justification of the foregoing enactments is given in the famous Golden Rule, which in Matthew comes much later, vii. 12. On its active side it is then further illustrated by 32–34.

32. Matt. v. 46. For 'what reward have ye?' Luke has 'what χάρις is yours?' The Greek word χάρις is by R.V. and W. translated 'thanks.' Holtzmann prefers the rendering 'Wohlgefallen,' 'favour,' which I have adopted in the translation. The meaning is in either case the same. It means reward from God.

Love does not here mean a mere feeling of affection. It means kindly service. 'To love' in 32 is not different in meaning from 'to do good to' in 33.

33 equals Matt. v. 47, with some change of phraseology.

34, 35. Luke only. 34 gives a further illustration of the principle that help and service should seek no human return. 34 comes to this, that the only lending which is meritorious in God's eyes is the loan which is practically equivalent to a gift.

35. The general maxim of 'love your enemies' is again repeated and expanded. It seems probable that 'children (or, sons) of the Most High' must be here taken, not in the sense of becoming like God by doing and being good, but as the promised heavenly reward. You will become sons of God at the Resurrection, *i.e.* like unto the angels. See especially Luke xx. 36 and *cp.* Wisdom of Solomon v. 5; Matt. v. 9. Perhaps, too, as W. thinks, the clause 'for he is good unto the ungrateful and the evil' has been appended later. In any case, it does not suit the connection. It has been added by Luke, B. Weiss thinks, from Matt. v. 45. The words μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες are variously translated. In accordance with Hellenistic usage R.V. renders 'never despairing,' but 'hoping for nothing in return' makes better sense, as Holtzmann says. Plummer holds strongly to the more accurate rendering of R.V., which, he says, means either, 'never doubting that God will requite you,' or 'never despairing about your money.' Another reading is μηδένα ἀπελπίζοντες, which is in accordance with the S.S. and supported by Merx. It means, according to him, 'not robbing any man of his hope,' *i.e.* disappointing nobody.

36. Matt. v. 48. Luke's 'pitiful' for Matthew's 'perfect' seems more natural, simple and original. It seems, too, to add the idea, also expressed at the end of 35, that the good we are to do our enemy is not to be done merely for our own sakes, but also for the sake of the enemy. And perhaps underlying the injunction about the cheek and the cloak is the idea that by this humility and non-resistance you may shame the sinner and man of violence into righteousness and peace.

'Your Father' for 'God' in Luke only here and xii. 30, 32.

37-42. AGAINST JUDGING AND CONDEMNING ONE'S NEIGHBOUR

(*Cp.* Matt. vii. 1-5, xv. 14, x. 24, 25)

37 'Judge not, and ye shall not be judged: condemn not, and ye
38 shall not be condemned: acquit, and ye shall be acquitted. Give,
and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, shaken
together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom. For
with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again.'

39 And he spoke a parable unto them, 'Can the blind lead the
40 blind? will they not both fall into the ditch? The disciple is
not above his master: but he that is quite perfected will be
41 like his master. And why lookest thou at the splinter that is
in thy brother's eye, but perceivest not the beam that is in thine
42 own eye? How canst thou say to thy brother, Brother, let me
pull out the splinter that is in thine eye, when thou thyself seest
not the beam that is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, first
pull the beam out of thine own eye, and then thou wilt see clearly
to pull out the splinter that is in thy brother's eye.

This passage is in Matthew separated by a whole chapter from what precedes. Luke seems still to be partly thinking of the enemy. Some think that the judging, condemning and acquitting do not refer to the law courts, but to our daily intercourse with, and opinion of, our neighbours. Apparently even the enemy is not to be denounced. (May one then cry 'Woe' upon him and call him a viper?)

37. Matt. vii. 1. The wording seems to mean that we are not to punish those who have done us wrong, and if they have already been punished or condemned, we are to set them free, because we all need similar mercy from God. (So B. Weiss, *Quellen*, A, p. 261). Whether the reference is to general behaviour or to actual conduct in reference to law-suits and the courts seems uncertain.

38. Here Luke seems to return to the doctrine of active benevolence. There is no clear connection between 37 and 38. The end of 38 is found in Matt. vii. 2, but is there used in a totally different way. The rest of 38 is not found in Matthew. The Greek 'they will give' is equivalent to the impersonal passive, 'it shall be given you.' The giver is God in the future world. W. thinks that the redundant phrase, 'good measure—into your bosom,' has been added. The measure in Luke refers to giving;

in Matthew (vii. 2) to judging. If the words 'good measure—bosom' are not omitted, the last words of the verse are, as Weiss points out, not here suitably affixed. The former speak of an overflowing recompense; the latter, from another point of view, speak of an exact quantitative equivalent.

39. Apparently a fresh subject. If 39 and 40 are an introduction to 41, then it may be said that they still continue the subject of charity in judgment, even as Matt. vii. 3 continues the thought of 1, 2. But the main thought of Matt. vii. 1–3 has been obscured in Luke by the insertion of 38 *a*, 'give and it shall be given unto you.' As the text now stands, the connection between 38 and 39 is very poor. It is also noticeable that 39 has a fresh preamble. Its material is used in Matt. xv. 14; the material of verse 40 in Matt. x. 24, 25. Matt. xv. 14 is an attack upon the Scribes. Here the substance of it seems to be used as an introduction to 40 (Matt. x. 24), which appears to warn the disciples and others of false teachers and innovations. The Christian teacher must not go beyond, or deviate from, or alter, the words of Christ. The disciple, even when perfected, cannot be above his master: in his perfection he can only be just like his master. Complete identity of teaching would mark the perfect disciple. The saying would not be out of harmony with certain Rabbinic ideas, but if it occurred in the Talmud, the German Protestant theologians would probably quote it to show the stagnant unprogressiveness of Rabbinic teaching. Another meaning assigned to 39 and 40 is that they are a warning against false teachers in the sense that, as the disciple cannot, at best, see farther or be better than his master, the choice of a false master will inevitably produce an erring disciple. J. Weiss thinks that in this connection 39 and 40 are a warning against 'judging.' Imperfect disciples are not fit to judge.

41, 42. Matt. vii. 3–5. In Matthew the connection between vii. 1, 2 and 3–5 is good and regular enough, but between 39 and 40, or between 40 and 41, the connection is poor. Loisy holds that 39 and 40 are inserted here by Luke, whereas Matthew has them in a more original context. Luke apparently saw a connection between the mote and the beam, and the blind leading the blind. The blind who leads the blind will never reach his goal, for the disciple ('en tant que disciple, et vu les habitudes de l'enseignement rabbinique, sorte de tradition orale apprise de mémoire') cannot be more learned than his master. The man with the beam can no more help the man with the mote than the blind can lead the blind. The introductory formula in 39 ('he spoke a parable unto them') shows that Luke is making an intercalation; he misunderstood the logical connection between the precept about judging and the metaphor of the mote and the beam (*E. S.* I. p. 624).

43–45. THE CRITERION OF VIRTUE

(*Cp.* Matt. vii. 16–21, xii. 33–35)

43 ‘For a good tree bringeth not forth rotten fruit; neither doth
44 a rotten tree bring forth good fruit. For every tree is known by
its own fruit. For from thorns men do not gather figs, nor from
45 a bramble bush do they pluck grapes. The good man out of the
good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good; and
the evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth
that which is evil: for from the abundance of the heart his mouth
speaketh.

43, 44. Rather than judge another, let the disciple be careful that he is a true disciple in deed and not only in word. And the true test of the good and true disciple is his life. If he is good, his works are good, and by his works and deeds he can be recognized for what he truly is.

45. Good, right words show good, right heart, and *vice versâ.*

46–49. HEARING AND DOING

(*Cp.* Matt. vii. 21, 24–27)

46 ‘And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not that which I say?
47 Whoever cometh to me, and heareth my words, and doeth them,
48 I will show you to whom he is like: he is like a man who built an
house, and digged deep, and laid the foundation on the rock:
and when a flood came, the stream dashed against that house, and
49 could not shake it: for it was well built. But he that heareth,
and doeth not, is like a man that built an house upon the ground
without a foundation; and when the stream dashed against it,
it fell in immediately; and the ruin of that house was great.’

As in Matthew’s enlarged version, so in Luke, the point of view implies a large community which had already existed some time, and possessed many nominal, and some excellent adherents. A mere nominal adherence will not suffice at the Judgment. Excellent and sensible doctrine: a justification of works. The metaphors in Luke and Matthew show some variants in language and working out. B. Weiss supposes that 46–49 are drawn from L, and are not an adaptation of Q.

sends the Jewish elders to Jesus instead of coming himself. Hence the addition of 4 and 5. Then friends are made to say the words, which are scarcely suitable except in the centurion's own mouth, in 6–8. The differences between Matthew and Luke's narrative are assigned by B. Weiss to Luke having combined Q's version and L's version of the story. Loisy thinks that the differences are due to Luke himself. The centurion in Luke markedly resembles Cornelius in Acts x. If the centurion does not himself go to meet Jesus, it is because he, and not merely his servant, symbolizes the Gentiles, and therefore must not come into immediate contact with Jesus (*E. S.* I. p. 651).

11–17. THE YOUNG MAN OF NAIN

(Luke only)

11 And it came to pass the day after, that he went to a city called Nain; and many of his disciples went with him, and a
12 great crowd. Now when he came near the gate of the city, behold, a dead man was being carried out, the only son of his mother, and she was a widow: and many people of the city were
13 with her. And when the Lord saw her, he felt compassion for
14 her, and he said unto her, 'Weep not.' And he came and touched the bier: and they that bore it stood still. And he said, 'Young
15 man, I say unto thee, Arise.' And the dead man sat up, and
16 began to speak. And Jesus gave him to his mother. And fear seized them all: and they glorified God, saying, 'A great prophet
17 has risen up among us; God has visited his people.' And this report about him went forth throughout all Judæa, and throughout all the region round about.

This story is found only in Luke. He requires it here to substantiate one of the statements in vii. 22. Is it taken from a 'source'? Or is it the work of the Evangelist? So Loisy. Yet it seems unlikely that he invented it. He may, however, use it for purely symbolic purposes. 'As in the preceding narrative, the Evangelist gives us a glimpse of the salvation of the Gentiles under the figure of the healing of a pagan, carried out at a distance from Jesus, he now directs the reader's thoughts towards the work which Jesus carried out directly, the salvation of Israel, realized in the persons of a group of believers who constituted the original kernel of Christianity. The afflicted widow represents the daughter of Zion, Jerusalem, threatened with the loss of Israel, her only son, and in fact losing him, to regain him miraculously by the power of Jesus. Thanks to him, the promises of God are not empty, and the mother who had wept for her dead son can see him again living' (*E. S.* I. p. 655). It is noticeable that the miracle is increased by the absence of any 'faith' exhibited by anybody. Jesus touches the bier, perhaps, as W. says, to bid the bearers stop: in the original story he probably touched the body. This is avoided to heighten the marvel. For the Jewish customs in burial, see Additional Note 42. The story is clearly based upon the stories of Elijah and Elisha in 1 Kings xvii. 17–24 and 2 Kings iv. 33–37. Almost each detail in the Elisha story finds its parallel here. The rest is taken from other stories—the daughter of Jairus, the healing of the paralytic, and so on. It must be admitted that the number of these parallels speak for the invention of the tale by the Evangelist. But how came he to think of putting the scene of the story at Nain? Why should he have deliberately chosen this particular place, unless there was at least some record or tradition that at Nain Jesus had worked a stupendous miracle?

13. 'The Lord.' Jesus is often called so by Luke (or, as B. Weiss holds, by L), but not by Mark. But we may have here a case of later interpolation or editing. So Merx. Jesus is not called 'Lord' in these passages in the S.S. Spitta holds that 16, 17 is the right conclusion (in the 'Grundschrift') to the Sermon in the Plain. 'When Jesus had finished all these words in the hearing of the people, fear seized them all &c.' (vii. 2–15 are insertions by the Evangelist.) But 'fear' would not come upon the people on account of the Sermon: it would on account of a startling miracle. Spitta compares Luke vii. 16 with Mark i. 22 (reproduced in Luke iv. 32), but ἐξεπλήσσοντο is not the same as φόβος ἔλαβεν πάντας. A prophet might be expected not merely to speak, but also to work miracles. *Cp.* Elijah. That God had visited his people would be a reasonable reflection after a stupendous miracle, but not after a noble speech.

18–35. John the Baptist and his Enquiries

(*Cp.* Matt. xi. 1–19)

8, 19 And the disciples of John told him of all these things. And
John called unto him two of his disciples, and sent them to Jesus,
saying, 'Art thou he that is to come? or are we to wait for
20 another?' When the men had come unto him, they said, 'John

the Baptist has sent us unto thee, saying, Art thou he that is to
21 come? or are we to wait for another?' And in that same hour he
cured many of sicknesses and afflictions and of evil spirits; and unto
22 many that were blind he gave sight. And Jesus answered and
said unto them, 'Go, and tell John what ye have seen and heard;
the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf
hear, the dead are raised, and the poor receive the good tidings.
23 And happy is he who findeth no stumbling-block in me.'

24 And when the messengers of John departed, he began to speak
unto the people concerning John: 'Why went ye out into the
25 wilderness? To see a reed shaken with the wind? Or why went
ye out? To see a man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they
who wear grand clothing and live luxuriously are in the palaces of
26 kings. Or why went ye out? To see a prophet? Yea, I say unto
27 you, and much more than a prophet. This is he of whom it is
written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, who shall
28 prepare thy way before thee. I say unto you, Among those that
are born of women none is greater than John the Baptist: yet he
that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he.'

29 And all the people that heard him, and the tax-collectors,
30 justified God, and were baptized with the baptism of John. But
the Pharisees and the teachers of the Law rejected the purpose of
God towards themselves, and would not be baptized by him.

31 'To whom then shall I liken the men of this generation? and
32 to what are they like? They are like unto children sitting in the
market-places, who call to one another, and say, We have piped
unto you, and ye have not danced; we have made lamentation,
33 and ye have not wept. For John the Baptist hath come, neither
eating bread nor drinking wine; and ye say, He has a demon.
34 The Son of man hath come eating and drinking; and ye say,
Behold a glutton, and a wine-bibber, a friend of tax-collectors and
35 sinners! And wisdom is justified by all her children.'

The source of this section is probably Q, though B. Weiss supposes that the variants show that it is taken from L.

John is in prison, but his disciples have access to him.

20, 21. Luke enlarges the wording of Matthew. He represents Jesus engaged in miraculous cures at the very moment of the embassy. Dr Carpenter thinks that the addition of 21 'translates into outward physical miracle the symbolic language in which Jesus was about to describe inward moral change' (*First Three Gospels*, pp. 173, 244). See notes on Matt. xi. 5.

27. J. Weiss thinks this verse has been inserted from Matt. xi. 10. Merx's views on this passage are very interesting and peculiar. First of all he holds that there are textual and other reasons for supposing that the words 'and much more than a prophet' at the end of 26 as well as all 27 are interpolated. Secondly he inserts with the S.S., some Greek MSS. and other authorities, 'prophet' after 'greater' in 28. What Jesus said was: 'I say to you that John was the greatest prophet ever born, but he who is less than he' (Merx inserts *αὐτοῦ* after *μικρότερος* with the MS. D and some other authorities) 'is in the kingdom greater than he.' And by the 'less than he' Jesus meant himself. (As to 29 Merx's view is also peculiar, but it would take too long to explain it here.) The point of his interpretation of 28 is that it is made to fit in with his whole conception of Jesus. Jesus is no prophet like John, and in that sense he is less than John, but his Kingdom is far greater than the old order. Jesus did not prophesy, but he knows himself to be the 'Träger des gar nicht mehr von ihm jüdisch apocalyptisch gedachten Himmelreiches.'

Loisy also thinks that 'prophet' inserted in 28 is the better reading, but that it is less near to the source. 'Prophet' was put in by Luke not to make it seem that John was the greatest of all those born of women. For Jesus was woman-born (*E. S.* I. p. 668, n. 4).

Spitta thinks that many points in Luke's version of the story of John's enquiries confirm his view that Jesus is now in Judæa. The 'surrounding country' of 17 is Peræa, where John was ultimately imprisoned (in Machærus). Perhaps, however, John, according to the oldest story, was not yet in prison when he sent his messengers. In any case, they would have had much less far to go if Jesus was in Judæa. In verse 24 Jesus speaks as if the people had gone to see John only lately, and as if no great distance of space separated one from the other. I do not think that these arguments are valid.

29, 30. A curious insertion in the middle of Jesus's speech, which is abruptly resumed in 31. Luke, however, must have meant us to understand the verses as a part of Jesus's speech. As to the origin of the verses and their original position in the source (Q), opinions differ. Wernle supposes that they were inserted in this place on account of 35, 'Wisdom is *justified* of her children.' For the wording *cp.* Matt. xxi. 31, 32. The phrase 'justified God,' *i.e.* declared that God's will was just, sounds Pauline.

It means they acknowledged that John's mission was divine, and were baptized.

30. The phrase ἠθέτησαν εἰς ἑαυτούς is curious. It seems to mean that the Scribes frustrated God's will, so far as it concerned them, in that they denied John's divine mission, and were not baptized.

36–50. Love and Forgiveness

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 3–9; Matt. xxvi. 6–13)

36 And one of the Pharisees asked him to eat with him. And he
37 went into the Pharisee's house, and sat down to table. And,
behold, a woman in the city, who was a sinner, learnt that Jesus
sat at table in the Pharisee's house. And she brought an alabaster
38 box of ointment, and stood behind, at his feet, weeping, and began
to wash his feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hair of
her head, and kept kissing his feet, and anointing them with the
ointment.

39 Now when the Pharisee who had invited him saw it, he said
to himself, 'This man, if he were a prophet, would know who and
what sort of woman it is who is touching him: for she is a sinner.'
40 And Jesus answered and said unto him, 'Simon, I have something
41 to say to thee.' And he said, 'Speak, Master.' 'There was a
certain moneylender who had two debtors: the one owed five
42 hundred pieces of silver, and the other fifty. As they were unable
to pay, he remitted it to them both. Which, then, of them will
43 love him most?' Simon answered and said, 'I suppose the one
to whom he remitted most.' And he said unto him, 'Thou hast
rightly judged.'

44 And he turned to the woman, and said unto Simon, 'Seest
thou this woman? I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no
water for my feet: but she hath washed my feet with tears, and
45 wiped them with her hair. Thou gavest me no kiss: but she,
46 since I came in, hath not ceased to kiss my feet. My head with
oil thou didst not anoint: but she hath anointed my feet with
47 ointment. Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which were many,
have been forgiven, for she loved much: [but he to whom little is
48 forgiven, loveth little.]' And he said unto her, 'Thy sins are

49 forgiven. And they that sat at table with him began to say to
50 themselves, 'Who is this that even forgives sins?' And he said
to the woman, 'Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace.'

One of the greatest and most famous of Luke's additions to the Gospel store. The basis of this story is an incident recorded by Mark at the close of Jesus's career. This incident is transferred by Luke to the opening of his ministry and recast and enlarged. Perhaps Luke has put this story here to illustrate 34. 'He is a friend of sinners' (Müller, *Zur Synopse*, p. 7). It is quite possible that a considerable part of the story may be taken from another source than Mark (*e.g.* L), so that we may have two stories (and a parable) rolled into one. We can never know whether any particular words placed in Jesus's mouth were ever uttered by him. Jesus was not followed by stenographists, though we must not forget that Eastern memories are wonderfully retentive. However, just as it does not much matter whether Isaiah or a later editor wrote the great words, Isaiah ii. 1–5, so does it not much matter whether to Jesus or another are due the great words, vii. 47.

36. The host is changed from a leper into a Pharisee, but his name Simon is kept. One would not gather from 36 that Simon had asked Jesus to dine with him from any evil motive, or that he meant to give him a poor reception, but something of the sort seems implied in 44 and 45.

37. The harlot is able to enter uninvited the Pharisee's house. Nobody seems very astonished. W. says: 'The appearance of uninvited persons on such occasions does not seem to have been anything out of the way. We should be startled by the entrance of a harlot into even a company consisting solely of men in a very different way from the Pharisee.' See Additional Note 53.

38. 'She began to wash his feet.' 'This was no part of her original plan. She came to anoint his feet and was overcome by her feelings; hence "She began." The tears led to the wiping, which was also unpremeditated. Among the Jews it was a shameful thing for a woman to let down her hair in public; but she makes this sacrifice. *καὶ κατεφίλει.* Note the compound verb and the change of tense, "She continued to kiss affectionately." Kissing the feet was a common mark of deep reverence' (Plummer). There is something in the observation made by Havet as to the contrast between this scene in Luke and the scene in Mark xiv. 3–9. 'Là, un acte d'adoration religieuse faite avec simplicité; ici, des élans de passion et de véritables caresses.' Women play a

greater part in Luke than in Mark or Matthew (*Le Christianisme et ses origines*, IV. p. 63).

39. One would like to omit the words 'for she is a sinner,' as one of the versions actually does. ἅπτεται, 'touches,' 'clings.' 'The verb implies more than mere touching and is the present of continuous action' (Plummer).

42. The parable does not fit the story which it is meant to illustrate. It does not substantiate the moral which one is intended to draw from it. For the parable says: The greater the measure of forgiveness, the greater the love which flows from and succeeds it. Much forgiveness causes much love. But what we find in the story is the reverse. The greater the love, the greater the forgiveness. Much love justifies much forgiveness.

It would therefore seem as if the parable had a separate origin and occasion, and was inserted here in this story from a mistaken conception of it.

47 *a*. 'Her sins, which were many, have been forgiven, for she loved much': because of her great love, she is forgiven. W. would read 'much to her' (following D) instead of 'Her sins, which were many,' *i.e.* Much is forgiven her, or remitted her, for she has loved much.

47 *b*. If the above interpretation of the story and the parable be correct, the last clause of 47 becomes impossible. It is based upon the idea that what Jesus wants to say is, not that the woman is forgiven because of the love which she has shown, but that the proof of her forgiveness is her love. Great love is the outflow of great forgiveness. Small forgiveness could only produce meagre love. But as this is surely not the original intention of the story, we must suppose that when the parable was inserted, the antithetic corollary 47 *b* ('he to whom little is forgiven loveth little') was added too.

The only other interpretation by which one can make all 47 consistent with the parable, and thus retain its second half, seems very strained. It consists in pressing the perfect tense of the verb: '*have been* forgiven.' It assumes that the woman had already repented ('perhaps quite recently and in consequence of Christ's teaching'). 'The teaching of Christ had brought her to repentance and to assurance of forgiveness, and this assurance had inspired her with love and gratitude. Jesus now confirms her assurance and publicly declares her forgiveness' (Plummer). 47 *a* means: 'For which reason, because she has shown much love, I say unto thee that her sins *have been* forgiven.' Jesus knows that *she* *realizes* that she is forgiven (and he asserts that her assurance is correct) because of the great love which she has shown. J. Weiss adopts this explanation also. Her loving demonstrations showed that she had much reason for gratitude and love. 'She must therefore through Jesus have become convinced of the forgiveness of her sins. Indirectly we here become aware what influence the preaching and personality of Jesus had upon such lost women. It gave them courage for a new life and the consciousness that, in spite of everything, they were still children of the heavenly Father—and the woman thanks him for that with an overflowing heart.' Whether according to this interpretation one must suppose that Jesus knew the woman already may remain uncertain. He may not have *told* her that her sins are forgiven: she feels and is convinced of it. But nevertheless, J. Weiss agrees that 47 *b* had best be omitted as an awkward and unnecessary interpolation; moreover, he is also obliged to excise 48. The forgiveness is not the reward of her love. Her love, on the contrary, is the gratitude shown for the conviction of forgiveness. Jesus has made her realize the depth and plenitude of God's pardoning love.

M. Loisy also makes a fine defence for this interpretation of the story, though for myself I feel still unconverted. To begin with he assumes that the tale is not a *mere* adaptation of Mark xiv. 3–9. There were two stories, both historic. The story which Luke found in his source was about a sinner and a penitent, but he added to it traits from the other story which he read in Mark. He added the anointing, the myrrh, the name of Simon. Luke wrongly thought that the two stories were concerned with the same person, whereas they had really nothing to do with each other. The story of the sinner must have happened in the Galilæan period. The fact that the *mise-en-scène* of both stories was a dinner led to their amalgamation.

The woman, he supposes, knew Jesus and had been touched by his words. She has determined to change her life. Why has she shown to Jesus the marks of devotion and honour which his host had not thought it necessary to show him? 'In the original narrative, the kiss must have been the essential point, and it would be enough to explain the offence caused to the Pharisee, by reason not of the act itself, but of the person to whom Jesus allows it. The kiss is for Orientals not only a mark of affection, it is also a mark of honour. To kiss the feet is a sign of entire submission. The penitent woman wishes to honour Jesus by humiliating herself; her tears attest her penitence' (*E. S.* I. p. 685).

The woman has shown him these marks of gratitude because she has received a great good. Her affection is the mark of her gratitude. 'Sa reconnaissance est en proportion de la grâce qu'elle a reçue' (*E. S.* I. p. 688). It is not implied that the Pharisee was a sinner. But though in the original story it was God who already had pardoned the woman's sins, and not Jesus, one has to admit that Jesus regards her loving manifestations to himself as the witness of her love towards God; from the love shown to him he infers God's pardon, 'qui n'a pu produire un tel amour dans une âme qu'il ne regarderait pas avec complaisance' (*E. S.* I. 691). He who shows such affection as that poor woman did, cannot be a sinner before God.

All this is ingenious, but hardly satisfactory. As to 47, Loisy too has to press the perfect tense. The love she shows proves that her sins have been forgiven. Finally 48–50 is Luke's false addition to the story. Luke wants us to believe that the forgiveness has not already taken place, but that Jesus accords it to the woman after her loving deeds. It is he who starts the usual interpretation: the great love causes the forgiveness. He reproduces words used elsewhere (v. 20, 21, viii. 48). 'Toute la finale présente ainsi un caractère artificiel, qui autorise le critique à distinguer entre l'application primitive de la parabole et le sens qui résulte de la combinaison rédactionelle' (*E. S.* I. p. 689). Loisy further supposes that the woman knew Jesus and had been touched by his words, but no one yet imagined that she had formed the intention to change her way of life. [But she had become repentant, and repentance brought with it the conviction of God's pardon, and her gratitude is shown to Jesus, who, whether consciously to himself or not, had been the proximate author of her repentance and her forgiveness. The statements in this last sentence are not definitely made by Loisy, but I infer that this is what he means.] Verse 47 in the original story probably followed immediately on 43. Verses 44–46, 'qui tournent en réquisitoire contre le pharisien,' have been added by Luke, who wanted to show here, as in 48–50, the Pharisee reproved as well as the woman pardoned (*E. S.* I. p. 690, n. 3).

I remain unconvinced: the parable does not, it is true, fit the story unless J. Weiss's or Loisy's interpretation is accepted. But surely if anybody reads the main incidents of the story without the parable, the impression as to what is meant is overwhelming. 48 is essential and not redactional. The forgiveness announced by Jesus is the essence of the story. And Jesus proclaims it as God's messenger on the strength of the repentant love or loving repentance which the woman has shown. That she hates her past life of sin is clear by the love she shows to Jesus. Hence Jesus, as God's prophet, announces that God has forgiven her sins.

B. Weiss (*Quellen*, A, pp. 203, 204) takes the same view as Loisy. The source of the story is, of course, L. Loisy supposes that story and parable were already comprised in 'le premier recueil du discours' (Q) and that Mark and Matthew voluntarily omitted them (*E. S.* I. p. 149).

The interpretation of Loisy and Weiss may seem to be also in better accordance with 50, where Jesus states that the woman's faith (and not her love) had caused her salvation; nevertheless it undoubtedly mars the beauty of the story, which largely consists in the loving appeal which the woman makes to Jesus. 'Thy sins are forgiven' must be a new pronouncement, new even to her in its startling joyousness. And 49 is less forcible if it is not Jesus who here and now forgives her sins.

This story, with the saying 'her sins, which were many, have been forgiven, for she loved much,' is one of the great passages peculiar to the Gospel of Luke. It is a development of the doctrine that 'love covereth all sins.' We are not to understand by it, at all events to-day, that love cancels the *punishment* which would otherwise have had to be borne for committed sins. The point is rather that love is able to change the sinful nature, and to turn it towards goodness and God. Goethe teaches this lesson in his sublime but daring ballad, 'Der Gott und die Bajadere.' Love redeems.

Jesus had no other way of expressing all this than by saying, 'Her sins have been forgiven.' But it hardly seems going too far to assume that what he was keen about was the changed and repentant heart of the sinner. This changed and repentant heart implied the forgiveness of the sin.

Though it is God alone who has the power to forgive sin, at least in the old sense of remitting punishment (though, indeed, from our modern point of view, so far as by punishment we mean the natural effects of sin, it is doubtful whether we can conceive God as cancelling His own laws, which are a part of Himself), still we can understand that there is a sense in which a great man like Jesus might legitimately declare and announce forgiveness. By saying, 'Your sins are forgiven' he may mean, 'You need sin no more.' As physically, if some wise and big man says to us, 'You can walk,' he half gives us the power, which without him we could not have shown—he gives us the faith—and because he says we can, therefore we do; so morally, because the wise and big man, in whom we have faith and whom we greatly love, says we can be good, therefore we become and are good. He knows and realizes our dormant powers better than ourselves. He can say that our sins are forgiven in the sense that a new life can now begin for us.

48. We have seen that some think that the story, with its effect and its lesson, is really concluded at 47. 48 seems formed

on the pattern of v. 20, and 49 on that of v. 21. But I cannot help thinking that the emphatic affirmation of 48 is required. 49 and 50 may, however, have been added by a redactor or by the Evangelist.

50. This verse repeats 48. But here the cause of the forgiveness is not her love, but her faith. Nor is this conception unreasonable, even though 50 may be later than 47, for why did the woman buy the balsam and seek out the presence of Jesus? It must have been faith that he could help her in her need. She had heard that he was the friend of sinners, that he had come to call them to repentance, not by the method of denunciation, but by evoking their powers of love, by changing the character of their souls. And the knowledge of this, her belief in, and gratitude for, what she had heard of the new great teacher had already begun to work a revolution in her soul even before she entered the room. The power of Jesus's personality, even when he said no word, was able to do the rest. It is not necessary, with W., to see in 50 a trace of Paulinism.

Is it not wholly inconceivable that this exquisite story should ever cease to be one of the treasured religious possessions of the Western world? Dogmatic Christianity in the course of centuries may disappear; Trinitarianism may be succeeded by Unitarianism; but the words of Jesus will still continue to move and cheer the heart of man. If Judaism does not, as it were, come to terms with the Gospels, it must always be, I am inclined to think, a creed in a corner, of little influence and with no expansive power. Orthodox Jews would, I suppose, say that they want no more. Liberal Jews should be less easily satisfied.

CHAPTER VIII

1–3. JESUS AND HIS WANDERINGS

(Luke only)

1 And it came to pass afterwards, that he went from city to city and from village to village, preaching and proclaiming the good tidings of the kingdom of God. And the Twelve were with him,
2 and certain women, who had been healed of evil spirits and sicknesses, Mary called Magdalene, from whom seven demons had
3 gone out, and Joanna the wife of Chuza Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, who supported and attended to them from their property.

These verses occur in Luke only. The passage about the women who accompany Jesus and pay for the expenses of the journey is extremely interesting. It would seem indubitable that in his relations with, and in his effect upon, women Jesus was highly original, and that women considerably helped his cause and furthered his measure of success. What Luke says here is more or less guaranteed to us by Mark xv. 41. Loisy is perhaps right when he says: Luke has probably generalized more than the facts demanded when he speaks of women who had been 'possessed.' When he comes to details he only mentions one. The continual presence of the women is also probably somewhat exaggerated. Some women 'followed' from time to time; others helped. Luke represents Jesus as moving about Galilee more than Mark does.

2. She is perhaps called Magdalene because she came from the city of Magdala mentioned in Matt. xv. 39. There is no reason to identify her with the sinner of the preceding section.

4–15. THE PARABLE OF THE SOWER

(*Cp.* Mark iv. 1–20; Matt. xiii. 4–23)

4 And as a large crowd came together, and people flocked to
5 him from every city, he spoke by a parable: 'A sower went out
to sow his seed: and as he sowed, some seed fell by the way side;
6 and it was trodden down, and the birds of the air ate it up. And
some fell upon a rock; and as soon as it had sprung up, it withered
7 away, because it had no moisture. And some fell among thorns;
8 and the thorns grew up with it, and choked it. And some fell
upon good ground, and sprang up, and bore a crop, an hundred-fold. And when he had said these words, he cried, 'He that hath
ears to hear, let him hear.'

9 And his disciples asked him, saying, 'What may this parable
10 mean?' And he said, 'Unto you it hath been given to know the
mysteries of the kingdom of God: but to the others in parables;
that seeing they may not see, and hearing they may not under-
11 stand. This, then, is the parable: The seed is the Word of God.
12 Those by the way side are they that hear; then cometh the devil,
and taketh away the Word from their hearts, that they may not
13 believe and be saved. They upon the rock are they, who, when
they hear, receive the Word with joy; and these have no root; for
a while they believe, and in time of temptation they fall away.
14 And the seed which fell among thorns are they, who, when they
have heard, go forth, and are choked by the cares and riches and
15 pleasures of life, and they bring no fruit to perfection. But the
seed on the good ground are they, who having heard the Word
with a right and good heart, hold it fast, and bring forth fruit
with endurance.

Luke now returns to the thread of Mark's narrative which he had left at vi. 19. He omits for the present Mark iii. 20–30, and starts with Mark iv., inserting Mark iii. 31–35 shortly afterwards.

4. The *mise-en-scène* is indefinite. The situation in Mark had been used already by Luke in v. 3.

12. Luke mixes up in his explanation the seed and the men. 'Believe' is a special touch.

13. 'Fall away' for 'stumble.' The era of apostasy has already begun.

Whatever the date of the parable and of its application, how lofty and trenchant it is! It shows a fine width of view, and a deep insight into human nature.

16–18. The Hidden and the Revealed

(*Cp.* Mark iv. 21–25)

16 'No man, when he hath lighted a lamp, covereth it with a
vessel, or putteth it under a bed; but he putteth it on a lamp-
17 stand, that they who enter in may see the light. For nothing is
hid which shall not become disclosed; neither is any thing kept
18 secret which shall not be known and come to light. Take heed,
then, how ye hear: for whoever hath, to him shall be given; and
whoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he
seemeth to have.'

For 16 *cp.* xi. 33; for 17, xii. 2; for 18, xix. 26.

19–21. Jesus and his Family

(*Cp.* Mark iii. 31–35; Matt. xii. 46–50)

19 Then came to him his mother and his brothers, and they could
20 not get to him on account of the crowd. And it was told him:
'Thy mother and thy brothers stand without, desiring to see thee.'
21 And he answered and said unto them, 'My mother and my
brothers are they who hear the word of God, and do it.'

19. This verse does not quite correspond with 20. In 19 we may suppose that Jesus, as in 4, is out of doors, surrounded by a crowd; in 20 he would seem to be, as in Mark, within a house. The reason of the lack of consistency is that Luke has transposed the occasion and place of the story. As it now follows the parable of the sower, Jesus in 19 has to be out of doors, but in 20 Luke keeps to the wording of Mark iii. 32. The explanation given by B. Weiss that Luke here partly follows Q, the author of which source is also supposed to have had his own version of the story, seems unnecessary (*Quellen*, A, pp. 153–155). We may note that Luke's narrative is shorter and somewhat less harsh than the narratives of Mark and Matthew. The wording in 21 is influenced by the parable of the sower which has preceded.

22–25. THE STORM ON THE LAKE

(*Cp.* Mark iv. 35–41; Matt. viii. 23–27)

22 Now it came to pass on a certain day, that he went on to a boat with his disciples: and he said unto them, 'Let us cross over
23 unto the other side of the lake.' So they put forth. But as they were sailing, he fell asleep: and a storm of wind came down upon the lake; and they were filled with water, and were in danger.
24 And they came to him, and awoke him, saying, 'Master, master, we perish.' Then he arose, and rebuked the wind and the surge
25 of the water: and they ceased, and there was a calm. And he said unto them, 'Where is your faith?' And they were afraid and wondered, saying to one another, 'Who is this man that he commands even the winds and the water, and they obey him?'

Passing over Mark iv. 26–34, Luke now tells the story in Mark iv. 35 *seq.*

Luke omits Mark's indication of evening, which makes Jesus's sleep less natural.

25. Luke's version, 'Where is your faith?' has a more technically Christian ring than Mark's, 'Have ye still no faith?'

26–39. THE GADARENE SWINE

(*Cp.* Mark v. 1–20; Matt. viii. 28–34)

26 And they put in at the country of the Gerasenes, which is over
27 against Galilee. And when he had landed, a man met him from the city who was possessed by demons, and for a long time had worn no clothes, and abode in no house, but among the tombs.
28 When he saw Jesus, he cried out, and fell down before him, and with a loud voice said, 'What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou
29 Son of the Most High? I beseech thee, torment me not.' (For he had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man. For oftentimes it had seized him: and when he was guarded and bound with chains and in fetters, he would break the bonds, and
30 be driven by the demon into the desert.) And Jesus asked him, saying, 'What is thy name?' And he said, 'Legion': because
31 many demons had entered into him. And they besought him that he would not command them to go down into hell below.

32 And there was there an herd of many swine feeding on the mountain: and they besought him that he would allow them to enter
33 into them. And he allowed them. And the demons went out of the man, and entered into the swine: and the herd rushed down
34 the cliff into the lake, and were drowned. And when the swineherds saw what had happened, they fled, and told the story in the
35 city and in the country. And they came out to see what had happened; and they came to Jesus, and found the man, out of whom the demons had departed, sitting at the feet of Jesus,
36 clothed, and in his right mind: and they were afraid. And the eye-witnesses told them how the man that was possessed by the
37 demons was healed. And all the people of the district around the Gerasenes besought him to depart from them; for they were seized with great fear. So he embarked on to the boat, and returned.

38 Now the man out of whom the demons had departed besought him that he might remain with him: but Jesus sent him away,
39 saying, 'Return to thine own home, and tell what great things God hath done unto thee.' So he went away, and proclaimed throughout the whole city what great things Jesus had done unto him.

Luke keeps fairly closely to Mark and curtails less than Matthew.

31. The demons ask that they should not be sent into the abyss, which here means hell. Though their request is apparently granted, we are presumably to understand that owing to the suicide of the pigs, they arrive at last in hell all the same.

40–56. The Daughter of Jairus and the Woman with an Issue

(*Cp.* Mark v. 21–43; Matt. ix. 18–26)

40 And it came to pass, that, when Jesus returned, the crowd
41 received him: for they were all waiting for him. And, behold, there came a man named Jairus, and he was a ruler of the synagogue: and he fell down at Jesus's feet, and besought him that
42 he would come to his house: for he had a daughter, about twelve years of age, his only child, and she was dying.

43 But as he went the crowd pressed round him. And a woman
who had had an issue of blood twelve years, and had spent all her
fortune upon physicians, while none of them had been able to heal
44 her, came behind him, and touched the tassel of his garment: and
45 immediately her issue of blood stopped. And Jesus said, 'Who
touched me?' When all denied, Peter and they that were with
him said, 'Master, the crowd hang on thee, and press around thee.'
46 But Jesus said, 'Somebody has touched me; for I know that
47 power has gone out of me.' And when the woman saw that she
had not remained unnoticed, she came trembling, and falling
down before him, she told him before all the people for what
cause she had touched him, and how she was healed immediately.
48 And he said unto her, 'Daughter, thy faith hath healed thee; go
in peace.'

49 While he yet spoke, someone came from the ruler of the
synagogue's house, saying, 'Thy daughter is dead; trouble not
50 the Master any more.' But when Jesus heard it, he answered
him, saying, 'Fear not: only have faith, and she will be healed.'
51 And when he came into the house, he allowed no man to go in,
except Peter, and James, and John, and the father and the mother
52 of the child. And all were weeping, and were bewailing her: but
53 he said, 'Weep not; she is not dead, but sleeps.' And they
54 laughed him to scorn, knowing that she was dead. But he took
55 her hand, and called, saying, 'Maiden, arise.' And her spirit came
back, and she arose straightway: and he commanded that some-
56 thing should be given her to eat. And her parents were quite
beside themselves: but he bade them tell no one what had
happened.

Luke follows and adopts the version of Mark with unimportant changes. The girl is noted to be the only child. For 55 *cp.* 1 Kings xvii. 22.

CHAPTER IX

1–6. The Despatch of the Apostles

(*Cp.* Mark vi. 7–13; Matt. x. 1, 5–16)

1 And he called his twelve disciples together, and gave them
2 power and authority over all demons, and to cure diseases. And
3 he sent them to proclaim the kingdom of God, and to heal. And
he said unto them, 'Take nothing for your journey, neither staff
nor wallet, neither bread nor money; neither have two coats
4 apiece. And into whatever house ye enter, there abide, and thence
5 depart. And whoever will not receive you, go out of that city, and
shake off the dust from your feet as a testimony against them.'
6 And they departed, and went through village after village, preaching the gospel, and healing everywhere.

Mark vi. 1–6 has been already used, so Luke now passes on to Mark vi. 7.

4. The house is to be their resting-place and centre. From it they are to go forth on missionary efforts in the town, and to it they are to return. As in Matt. ix. 35, they are to proclaim the Kingdom of God.

7–9. Jesus and Herod Antipas

(*Cp.* Mark vi. 14–16; Matt. xiv. 1, 2)

7 Now Herod the tetrarch heard of all that was happening; and
he was perplexed, because it was said by some that John was
8 raised from the dead; and by some that Elijah had appeared;
9 and by others that one of the old prophets had risen again. And
Herod said, 'John have I beheaded: but who is this, of whom I
hear such things?' And he sought to see him.

7. Herod does not suppose that Jesus is the risen John, as in Mark. He hears the various reports and views about Jesus and is undecided and puzzled. *Cp.* the note on 23.

8. Luke has perhaps misunderstood Mark vi. 15. Mark says that one of the various views about Jesus was that he was a prophet, like the old prophets. This probably did not mean that he was one of the old prophets resurrected. See Wellhausen, *Einleitung*, p. 45.

9. The statement 'he sought to see him' is probably unhistorical. Herod sought to kill Jesus rather than to see him. So Luke xiii. 31 is probably more accurate.

10–17. THE FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND

(*Cp.* Mark vi. 31–44; Matt. xiv. 13–21)

10 And the apostles returned and told him all that they had done.
And he took them, and retired with them alone to a city called
11 Bethsaida. But the people perceived it and followed him: and he
received them, and spoke unto them of the kingdom of God, and
12 them that had need of healing he cured. And when the day
began to wane, the Twelve came, and said unto him, 'Send the
people away, that they may go into the villages and farms round
about, and lodge, and find food; for we are here in a lonely place.'
13 But he said unto them, 'Give ye them to eat.' And they said,
'We have no more than five loaves and two fishes; unless we
14 should ourselves go and buy food for all this people.' (For they
were about five thousand men.) But he said to his disciples,
15 'Make them sit down by companies of fifty.' And they did so,
16 and made them all sit down. Then he took the five loaves and
the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he said the blessing over
them, and broke them, and gave them to the disciples to set before
17 the people. And they ate and were satisfied: and there was taken
up of fragments that were left over by them twelve baskets.

Luke omits Mark vi. 17–29; he had used part of it before (iii. 18–20). The execution of John is not narrated by him, but implied in ix. 9.

The locality of the feeding miracle is given as Bethsaida; in Mark, Jesus only crosses over the lake to that village afterwards.

18–27. Jesus the Messiah—The Conditions of Discipleship

(*Cp.* Mark viii. 27–34, ix. 1; Matt. xvi. 13–28)

18 And it came to pass, as he was praying alone, his disciples were
with him: and he asked them, saying, 'Whom do the people say
19 that I am?' They answered and said, 'John the Baptist; and others,
Elijah; and others, that one of the old prophets is risen again.'
20 And he said unto them, 'But ye—whom say ye that I am?' And
21 Peter answered and said, 'The Messiah of God.' And he sternly
22 admonished and commanded them to tell this to no one; saying,
'The Son of man must suffer much, and be rejected by the Elders
and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and on the third day
be raised.'

23 And he said to them all, 'If any man would walk after me, let
24 him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me. For
whoever would save his life shall lose it: but whoever would lose
25 his life for my sake he shall save it. For what can it profit a man
26 if he gain the whole world, but hath lost or forfeited himself? For
whoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the
Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in his own glory, and in
27 his Father's, and the holy angels'. But I tell you of a truth, there
are some of those standing here who shall not taste death until
they see the kingdom of God.'

Luke now makes a great omission from Mark. He leaves out all between Mark vi. 45 and viii. 26. Why he does this is doubtful. Some of the material omitted Luke inserts later in another form, from another source (Q). But, as J. Weiss says, this does not account for the omission as a whole. Loisy supposes that Luke probably omitted these sections of Mark on purpose; he avoids 'les doubles emplois' (such as the two feeding miracles), and omits certain passages which were without special interest for his readers (*e.g.* the washing of the hands section), or which might perhaps irritate or shock them (*e.g.* the Canaanite woman) (*E. S.* I. p. 150).

Of the next important episode Mark and Matthew mention the locality, namely Cæsarea Philippi. Luke omits it.

18. The wording is odd. He prays alone; yet the disciples are with him.

19. The words: 'others that one of the old prophets is risen again' are wanting in the S.S. And D reads as in Matthew. In

any case 'a resurrected prophet' is probably not the original meaning, which was merely 'a prophet.'

20. The phrase is rather strange: 'The Messiah of God.' Mark has more simply: 'the Messiah'; Matthew, more fully, 'the Messiah, the Son of the living God.'

Luke omits the censure of Peter, contained in Mark viii. 32, 33; Matt. xvi. 22, 23.

23. This verse is highly important because of the small verbal addition which Luke has made to his source. The words in Mark, noble as they are, refer to a self-denial which is to end in martyrdom. But Luke adds the word 'daily'—'let him take up his cross daily'—and thus transforms the idea into that of a continuous self-denial, to be exhibited in ordinary and everyday life. The uplifting power of these verses none can measure. They may have partly helped to lead to the false asceticism of the Stylites order, but in a gigantic number of cases men and women have tried to save their own souls by active well-doing: the daily carrying of the cross has been realized in a life which has at least *sought* the welfare and benefit of others. The word 'daily' is, however, omitted in S.S. and may be a later, though highly significant addition.

Spitta has a long, interesting, highly ingenious, but unconvincing essay on the section in Luke dealing with the so-called Confession of Peter ('Das Gespräch Jesu mit seinen Jüngern in Bethsaida' in his *Streitfragen der Geschichte Jesu,* pp. 85–143). He holds that Luke has here, as often elsewhere, more faithfully copied the original edition of the 'Grundschrift' than Mark. In Luke ix. 1–6 we are told of the despatch of the disciples upon their missionary journey. As a result of that journey Herod becomes uneasy about Jesus. He does not, as in Mark, believe the report that John has come to life again. On the contrary he knows that John has been safely despatched. But who is Jesus? He wants to see him (perhaps to seize him). Immediately after the passage about Herod, Luke, still following the 'Grundschrift,' relates the return of the apostles, and Jesus retires with them to Bethsaida (10). Spitta adopts W.'s view that Jesus is alarmed by the reports about Herod which have reached him, and so, directly the apostles return, he leaves Herod Antipas's territory, and crosses over into the safer territory of Philip. The *ὄχλοι* ('the crowd') follow him. All this is indicated in the 'Grundschrift.' Next, Spitta assumes (from reasons too long to give) that the feeding miracle is an insertion in the 'Grundschrift.' He has to assume a complicated theory, according to which Luke knew and used not only the original, uninterpolated 'Grundschrift,' but also an edition in which the feeding story had been inserted. Spitta notes the view of W. and others that Mark vi. 30 or vi. 34–viii. 26 is a later insertion in Mark; this hypothesis all the more confirms his own that the original 'Grundschrift' did not contain these passages, and that Luke knew and used a copy of the 'Grundschrift' in which they were absent. Omitting the feeding of the five thousand, Luke ix. 18 joins on well to 11. Jesus is still in Bethsaida, and the 'crowd' is there as well as the disciples. It is to be noted that no indication of place is given for the conversation in 18–21. This Spitta holds to be correct and original; his explanation of Mark's inaccurate assignation of the locality to Cæsarea Philippi is too long to quote. Now be it observed that the disciples have only just returned from their journey. It is therefore reasonable that Jesus, who has heard the reports about Herod and his anxieties, should ask the disciples, 'Who do the crowd (ὄχλοι) say that I am?' Luke again preserves the original wording. But now Spitta gives a fresh explanation of the passage. The disciples knew well enough that Jesus was the Messiah. There is nothing even in Mark to show that they were ignorant of the fact, or that Peter said anything new. It is only Matthew who treats Peter's statement as a subject of special commendation and wonder. What Jesus asks is not, 'Whom do ye think that I am?' but 'Whom do ye *say* that I am?' *i.e.* in your dealings with the people. This interpretation, while avoiding certain difficulties, has yet many others of its own. If the disciples knew that Jesus was the Messiah, and he knew that they knew, how could he have supposed that they would not have mentioned his Messiahship in their journey? If it was to be a secret, how could he quietly ask them, 'Whom did ye say that I was?' rather than 'I hope you did not mention the truth about me that I am the Messiah.' Why had he not said to them when he sent them out: 'In no case are you to refer to my Messiahship'? Or if he had taken alarm about Herod, why was the Messiahship concealed before? To these obvious difficulties Spitta's replies seem to me very inadequate. I will not therefore give them. Either the command in verse 21, if the disciples knew already, comes too late, or we have to assume that it had not been given before, because, till Herod gave cause for anxiety, there was no need of it. But in that case how could the Messiahship have been concealed? Spitta's explanation and hypotheses fail at the crucial point.

He is more probable when he regards the first prediction of suffering and death as an insertion in the original 'Grundschrift.' What Jesus really did say as to his future at this period of his career is given in Luke ix. 44. It is short and mysterious, and omits any definite statement of death and resurrection. 'The Son of man will be delivered,' or 'is about to be given up, into the hands of men.' To that cryptic utterance it might well be that the disciples could not find the key (45).

Thus Spitta joins on ix. 23 to ix. 21, and he has a new and strange hypothesis about 23–27. It rests first upon the assumption that *καθ' ἡμέραν* is original, and not a later addition to the passage as we have it in Mark. Secondly, upon the dubious and doubtful hypothesis that *σταυρόν* ('cross') in 23 is not the original word, which was rather *φορτίον* ('burden') or an equivalent. Jesus is not referring to his death upon the cross. All he says is that those who now wish to follow him must be prepared for continual wandering, no settled home, daily toil. Apparently he thinks that *φορτίον* may even be meant literally, of the knapsack or *πήρα*! Jesus had forbidden the disciples to carry a knapsack, because he reckoned upon their hospitable reception. 'Wenn er hier die ihm Nachfolgenden auffordert ihre Last zu tragen, so rechnet er offenbar nicht auf so freundliche Begegnung auf der Reise.' Surely this is a materializing degradation of a noble passage. Spitta compares such passages as ix. 58–62 and xiv. 26. Crowds have followed Jesus from their homes into the territory of Philip. If they want to continue with him, they must be wanderers like him, and take up their burden (*φορτίον*) every day afresh. Ingenious as Spitta's essay is, and important as are his attempted proofs of the view that Luke does seem, every now and then, either to have copied from the earliest source or sources more accurately than Mark, or to have known an early source which Mark did not know, it will not, I fancy, be held that his interpretation of the 'Confession of Peter' or of Luke ix. 23 is correct and established.

25. In this verse, as in the whole section 23—27, the changes from Mark are inconsiderable. In the parallels to the section elsewhere Luke seems to have drawn on Q.

It is probable that passages of this kind started that Christian tendency of urging the individual to think of nothing so much as the salvation of his own soul which has often provoked Jewish criticism. The Jewish critic is inclined to say, first, that to worry yourself as to whether you are 'saved' or not is to cast, or to possess, unworthy and improper doubts upon the lovingkindness and forgiveness of God. Secondly, it makes for selfishness, because the most important thing to you becomes your own personal good, whereas it ought to be the good and welfare of others. Thirdly, it tends to morbidity and gloom, upon the one hand, or, when you have attained a conviction that you *are* saved, to self-righteousness and sanctimonious pride, upon the other. Fourthly, it tends to make people set about the right thing in a wrong way. It *is* of importance that you should lead a good and useful life, and if you do that, you will, as a matter of fact, be certainly 'saved.' But you had far better give your mind to the good and useful life (the means) rather than to the post-earthly results of that life. These you can and should, with confidence and cheery trust, leave to God. While on earth, you should think of how to spend your time on earth to the best advantage for your fellow-men and for the benefit of human society *upon earth.* If you are always thinking of what is to befall you after death, you are far less likely to lead a cheery, useful and beneficent life upon earth. Salvation, like happiness, is best secured by not thinking too much about it.

There is doubtless some truth in these criticisms. They supply a useful corrective to exaggerations and caricatures of the doctrine indicated in this verse. But in itself the doctrine is not unsound. Assume an eternal life of blessedness after death, *really believe in it,* and clearly the only wise use of 'time' can be in so employing it as to obtain 'eternity.' Moreover, we may regard the doctrine of the verse as a form of self-development or self-culture. And we know that the old puzzle as to the apparently conflicting claims of developing 'self' and of working for others can only be solved in practice by holding that both are primary duties, and that in most cases, if not really in all, that which is the 'right' thing for any individual to do under given circumstances (however difficult for *him* to determine), is best for his 'soul' *and* best for the world.

26. Luke has slightly modified Mark's language, 'plutôt pour la solennité de l'expression que pour le développement de l'idée. Il en résulte néanmoins une sorte de trinité, où la place assignée aux anges caractérise la position théologique de l'auteur. *Cp.* xii. 8, 9, xv. 10, xvi. 22, xxii. 43; se rappeler le rôle des anges dans les récits de l'enfance' (*E. S.* II. p. 26, n. 7).

28–36. THE TRANSFIGURATION

(*Cp.* Mark ix. 2–8; Matt. xvii. 1–8)

28 And it came to pass, about eight days after these sayings,
that he took with him Peter and John and James, and went up
29 on to the mountain to pray. And as he prayed, the appearance of
his face was changed, and his raiment became white and shining.
30 And, behold, two men were talking with him, who were Moses
31 and Elijah: they appeared in glory, and spoke of his end which he

32 was about to fulfil at Jerusalem. But Peter and they that were
with him were heavy with sleep: and when they woke up they saw
33 his glory, and the two men that stood with him. And it came to
pass, as they were parting from him, Peter said unto Jesus, ‘Master,
it is good for us to be here: let us make three tents; one for thee,
and one for Moses, and one for Elijah’—not knowing what he said.
34 While he thus spoke, there came a cloud, and overshadowed them:
35 and they feared as they entered into the cloud. And a voice came
36 out of the cloud, saying, ‘This is my chosen Son: hear him.’ And
as the voice passed, Jesus was found alone. And they kept silence,
and told no man in those days of anything which they had seen.

31. Luke ventures to give the subject-matter of the conversation of Jesus with Elijah and Moses. It was about his death in Jerusalem.

32. The rare word διαγρηγορήσαντες must here probably be taken to mean: ‘when they woke up.’

34. The appearance of the cloud alarms the disciples. ‘Overshadowed *them*’; probably Moses and Elijah (with Jesus) are meant, but perhaps the disciples are also included: ‘as they entered,’ *i.e.* Moses and Elijah and Jesus.

36. *ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι τὴν φωνήν*, either (1) ‘And when the voice came’ (so R.V.), or (2) ‘after the voice had passed’ (so Plummer and R.V. mg.).

37–43 *a*. The Epileptic Child

(*Cp.* Mark ix. 14–29; Matt. xvii. 14–21)

37 And it came to pass, on the next day, as they came down from
38 the mountain, that a large crowd met him. And, behold, a man
from the crowd cried out, saying, ‘Master, I beseech thee, look
39 upon my son: for he is mine only child. And, lo, a spirit seizes
him, and he suddenly screams; and it tears him so that he foams,
and leaves him only with reluctance, after bruising him sorely.
40 And I besought thy disciples to cast it out; but they could not.’
41 And Jesus answering said, ‘O faithless and perverse generation,
how long shall I be with you, and bear with you? Bring thy son
42 hither.’ And while he was coming, the demon tore him and

convulsed him. And Jesus rebuked the unclean spirit, and he
43 healed the child, and gave him back to his father. And they were
all amazed at the mighty power of God.

The boy is made an only child as in vii. 12 and viii. 42.

43 *b*—45. SECOND PREDICTION OF SUFFERING

(*Cp.* Mark ix. 30–32; Matt. xvii. 22, 23)

But while all marvelled at all the things which he did, he said
44 unto his disciples, 'As for you, put these words into your ears: the
45 Son of man will be delivered into the hands of men.' But they
understood not this saying, and it was hidden from them, in order
that they should not perceive it: and they were afraid to ask him
about this saying.

The disciples' elation at the Master's triumph is intentionally humiliated by Jesus. He predicts his coming defeat and sufferings. The resurrection is here omitted, so that there may be no light to the shadow (Holtzmann). For another view (namely, that we have here the oldest record of the prediction, according to which Jesus merely predicted his defeat, but said nothing about his resurrection), see note on verse 23.

44. 'Put these words into your ears,' *i.e.* the words which are to follow—namely (γάρ), that 'the Son of man will be delivered into the hands of men.'

46–50. WHO IS THE GREATEST?

(*Cp.* Mark ix. 33–41; Matt. xviii. 1–5)

46 And a dispute arose among them, as to which of them was
47 the greatest. And Jesus, knowing the thought of their heart, took
48 a child by the hand, and set him by him, and said unto them,
'Whoever receiveth this child in my name receiveth me: and
whoever receiveth me receiveth him that sent me: for who is
least among you all, he is great.'

49 And John answered and said, 'Master, we saw one casting out
demons in thy name; and we prevented him, because he does not
50 follow us.' And Jesus said unto him, 'Prevent him not: for he
that is not against us is for us.'

The words which Jesus says in Luke at the end (ix. 48) seem more rightly placed by Mark (ix. 35) at the beginning. For the disciples dispute as to which among them is, or shall be, the greatest, and Jesus replies that in *his* community and kingdom the only greatness lies in lowly and useful service. The child is used for, and represents, another though kindred lesson, namely, that kindness and service, rendered to the poorest in Christ's name, are the true tests of true discipleship. But W. supposes that in Luke the intention may be somewhat different. 46 and 47 may be connected by supposing that the disciples are discussing who is nearest to the Master, and in that sense greatest. Jesus would then say: close relationship with him does not matter. Loving service shown to the lowliest in his name counts as if it were done to him. With this interpretation 49 and 50 might harmonise. Even any formal connection with the apostles is not necessary in order to be a Christian.

In this view 48 *b* ('who is least among you all, he is great') becomes isolated. Altogether W.'s hypothesis is dubious. For it may be questioned whether the loving service rendered to the lowly (symbolized by the reception of the child) is not meant to show that it is humility alone which makes a man great or greatest in the eyes of Jesus and of God. Loisy thinks that Luke, like Mark, is really referring to Paul (*E. S.* II. p. 72). Spitta (*Streitfragen der Geschichte Jesu*) has a peculiar view of Luke ix. 46–48 which in his opinion is (except for 48 *a*) highly original and authentic. Jesus, according to Spitta, puts the child next to him to illustrate by this simple symbolic action the meaning of 48 *b*—ὁ μικρότερος, &c. [omit γάρ and join καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς to ὁ μικρότερος]. The smallest disciple is already great by the mere fact of his discipleship. He who, like the child, stands by Jesus's side is already great. A direct answer to the question: who is the greatest? is not given. ix. 48 *a* has been inserted from Mark ix. 37. This view is ingenious, but unconvincing. It seems to lay too much stress upon greatness consisting, not in service, but in the mere fact of belonging to the Master.

51–56. THE JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM—THE SAMARITAN VILLAGE

(Luke only)

51 And it came to pass, when the days for his being taken up
(into heaven) were fulfilled, he stedfastly set his face to go to
52 Jerusalem. And he sent messengers before him, and they went,

and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to prepare for him.
53 And they did not receive him, because his face was turned to go
54 to Jerusalem. And when his disciples James and John saw it,
they said, 'Lord, wouldst thou that we bid fire to come down from
55 heaven, and consume them?' But he turned, and rebuked them.
56 And they went to another village.

A new section begins here. A break is made in the narrative of Mark, which is not resumed till xviii. 15. The section is Luke's 'great insertion' or wedge driven into the Marcan narrative. Luke places in this section a number of anecdotes and sayings for which his sources did not give him place or date. The insertion begins nearly at the point where Mark has finished the Galilæan ministry and starts the journey to Jerusalem. Mark x. 1 corresponds in fact with Luke ix. 51. It has been supposed that Luke desired us to regard the whole insertion from ix. 51 to xviii. 14 as incidents which happened on the journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. The insertion is usually called by the Germans: 'Der lukanische Reisebericht.' Luke ix. 50 corresponds with Mark ix. 40. Mark ix. 41–50 is here omitted, though for 42 there is a parallel in Luke xvii. 1, 2 and for Mark ix. 49, 50 in Luke xiv. 34, 35. Spitta thinks that the reason for the omission of Mark ix. 41–50 in Luke ix. is that it was a later insertion into the original 'Grundschrift.' Spitta has a further very peculiar view about Luke ix. 51–56 usually regarded as the first section of the 'great insertion.' He, on the contrary, thinks that the insertion does not begin till 57, and that 51–56 still belongs to the 'Grundschrift.' He holds that W. is quite wrong in his condemnation of Luke's geography. He thinks that Jesus did really travel *via* Samaria to Jerusalem which was the usual route (see Josephus, *Antiquities*, xx. 6, 1). And one of the regular roads to Jerusalem from Samaria was through Jericho. I can only quote without discussing the divergent views of the authorities, but certainly Spitta seems more correct as to the geography.

Jesus sets his face towards Jerusalem. 'We now get many important didactic passages which have no parallel in Mark, and not even in Matthew. It is on the journey to Jerusalem that Jesus, according to Luke, utters a good deal of his most important teaching, though some of it does not suit the situation. Jesus, with Luke (as in John), journeys through Samaria, and not, as in Mark and Matthew, through Peræa. That nevertheless he passes by Jericho is a sign of Luke's naïve ignorance of the geography of Palestine. [This seems doubtful.] Jesus does not avoid the Samaritans, contrary to Matt. x. 5. He combats the prejudice against them (x. 33, xvii. 16). He does not regard the Jewish hostility to the Samaritans as justified because it is returned. Nor are all the Samaritans hostile. If in one Samaritan village he, as a Jew, is rejected, another village receives him' (W.).

The story of the inhospitable Samaritans Luke must have taken from one of his extra sources. To B. Weiss that source is always one and the same for almost all Luke's special stories and parables. But this theory is not yet generally accepted, and there seems a good deal which can be said against it. Nevertheless, it is probable that one of Luke's main sources did group a considerable part of Jesus's sayings and doings between the Galilæan and Jerusalem period, as indeed we have also an interval in Mark between the two periods, namely, the interval between vii. 24 and ix. 50.

51. The verse corresponds to Mark x. 1, and then the 'great insertion' begins. The noun *ἀνάλημψις* ('assumption') is only found here in the New Testament. It refers to the ascension into heaven. For the wording *cp.* Sirach xlviii. 9, xlix. 14; 2 Kings ii. 11; 1 Macc. ii. 58. 'The days were fulfilled': *i.e.* the appointed time had nearly arrived. The 'days' neared their end.

53. They were supposed to be pilgrims going up to Jerusalem, the hated religious centre, for the Passover festival. Hence the Samaritans were less than ever disposed to receive them kindly.

55. Many MSS. add: 'and he said, Know ye not what manner of spirit ye are of?' or, as otherwise rendered: 'and he said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.' And some MSS. add further: 'For the Son of man did not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them.' These additions are in true accordance with the best spirit of the gospel and of Jesus. They may be compared with the sublime words in Luke xix. 10, which so strikingly use and apply Ezekiel xxxiv. 16: 'The Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost.' There we have Jesus at his best. There is no reason to think that the object of his mission, as here expressed, was not realized by himself. To seek and save the lost was doubtless one of the objects which, as he believed and truly believed, God had commissioned him to discharge. And of how much goodness and self-sacrifice through the ages has not the 'imitation of Christ' in this regard been the source! It has been the motive for innumerable deeds of patient heroism, and has redeemed much sinfulness, and restored many wanderers from virtue to goodness and to God. But how strange it is that Jesus himself did not realize that if this was the Son of man's mission, it should have been applied, and was applicable, to

the Scribe and the Pharisee as well as to the outcast and the tax-collector. Had not Scribe and Pharisee also souls to save? And if they opposed the new teacher, was it not his business, on his own principles, to return the soft answer which removes wrath? But so it was and so it is. To follow the ideal when it is personally distasteful is ever the hardest for mortal man. And so strange is the human heart in its casuistry and self-deceit, that Jesus had probably no idea that he was violating his own principles. Though he taught that it was just the 'Pharisees and Scribes' who were really lost, he made no genuine effort to win them over or to save them. By his virulent denunciations—assuming them to be genuine—he only deepened their antagonism, and from his point of view made the lost souls still more certainly lost. If he saved some, he destroyed others, or at least permitted and even foretold, with satisfaction and some zest, their assured destruction. And the Church has followed in the footsteps of her Master. She too has both reclaimed and rejected, saved and destroyed. She has indeed sought out the lost when they were willing to agree with her dogmas, but directly they did not see eye to eye with her in all things, she has scattered ruin and ban, fulminated and destroyed. She has persecuted the heretic on earth, and proclaimed his eternal damnation in hell.

Jesus is constantly brought into comparison with Elijah. He outdoes Elijah's greatest miracles. And if his disciples do not punish the churlish village with heavenly fire, this is not due to lack of might in their Master, but to the difference of his mission. Jesus is greater than Elijah, and a higher spirit inspires him. The contrast and reference are to 2 Kings i. 10–12. There is truth in this conception, though it may by no means always be historical truth. Many of the parallels and contrasts may have been constructed after the death of Jesus, but there may be ideal truth in them, though not truth of fact. For the addition, *cp. First Three Gospels*, pp. 24, 25.

56. As we have just seen, W. supposes the other village to have been another Samaritan village, but Holtzmann takes the opposite view. He says: 'One would only then have to conclude that the "other village" was Samaritan, if one had to infer from xvii. 11 that Jesus's journey was continued through Samaria. But in truth this paragraph contains the reason why this did not take place. The new section of Luke opens with a rejection in Samaria, as the former section had begun with a rejection in Galilee.' This view seems less probable. Loisy agrees with W. And he is right in adding: 'The Samaritans, who are a type of the Gentiles, are less reproved than the Jews' (*E. S.* II. p. 102).

57–62. DISCIPLESHIP AND ITS CONDITIONS

(Matt. viii. 19–22)

57 And as they went on their way, a man said unto him, 'Lord, I
58 will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.' And Jesus said unto
him, 'The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests;
59 but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.' And he said
unto another, 'Follow me.' But he said, 'Lord, allow me first to
60 go and bury my father.' But Jesus said unto him, 'Let the dead
bury their dead: but go thou and proclaim the kingdom of God.'
61 And another also said, 'Lord, I will follow thee; but first permit
62 me to take farewell of those at my home.' And Jesus said unto
him, 'No man, who hath put his hand to the plough, and then
looketh back, is fit for the kingdom of God.'

57, 58. *Cp.* Matt. viii. 19, 20. The place which Luke chooses for these verses seems more suitable than Matthew's, but in either case the picture of the hunted outcast or homeless wanderer which is suggested can scarcely be historical, even though the passage be taken from Q. There is, at any rate, no reason to suppose that Jesus had bodily sufferings before he reached Jerusalem.

59. Matt. viii. 21. Luke's version of the famous reply becomes far more intelligible by his making Jesus begin by saying 'Follow me.' Moreover in Luke the man is not yet a disciple. Matthew's awkward words: 'another of the disciples' are avoided.

60. The addition 'Go thou and proclaim the Kingdom of God' is only in Luke, and is important. Discipleship includes the duty of missionary work.

61, 62. The story of the third candidate for discipleship is only found in Luke. Once more the parallel with, and the contrast to, Elijah are to be noted. Elisha may go first and kiss father and mother; the would-be disciple of Jesus may neither bid farewell to them nor bury them.

The reply of Jesus is magnificent. It must have induced many a doubting and weary labourer to continue without flinching some hard and self-sacrificing task.

CHAPTER X

1–16. The Seventy Disciples

(*Cp.* Matt. ix. 37, 38, x. 7, 8, 10–16, 40, xi. 21–23)

1 After these things the Lord appointed yet seventy others, and
sent them two and two before him unto every city and place,
2 whither he himself intended to go. And he said unto them, 'The
harvest is large, but the labourers are few: beseech, therefore, the
Lord of the harvest that he send out labourers into his harvest.
3 Go forth; behold, I send you out as lambs in the midst of wolves.
4 Carry neither purse, wallet, nor shoes: and salute no man on the
5 way. And into whatever house ye enter, first say, Peace be to this
6 house. And if a son of peace be there, your peace will rest upon
7 him: if not, it will return to you. And remain in the same house,
eating and drinking what is theirs: for the labourer is worthy of
his hire. Go not from house to house.

8 'And into whatever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat
9 what is set before you: and heal the sick that are therein, and
say unto them, The kingdom of God hath come nigh unto you.
10 But into whatever city ye enter, and they receive you not, go out
11 into its streets, and say, Even the very dust of your city, which
cleaveth to us, we do wipe off against you: yet know this, that the
12 kingdom of God hath come nigh. But I say unto you that it shall
be more tolerable in that day for Sodom, than for that city.

13 'Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if
the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which have
been done in you, they would have long ago repented, sitting in
14 sackcloth and ashes. But it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and
15 Sidon at the Judgment than for you. And thou, Capernaum,

which wast exalted unto heaven, shalt be thrust down unto Hades.
16 He that heareth you heareth me; and he that rejecteth you rejecteth me; and he that rejecteth me rejecteth him that sent me.'

Luke had already told of the despatch of the Twelve, mainly following Mark; here he tells the same story over again following another source (Q), which Matthew had also used, though he mingled it with Mark. Luke makes the repetition possible by enlarging the number of the missionaries to 70, who are thus distinguished from the first twelve. The 70 represent the 70 nations of Genesis x., *i.e.* the whole heathen world. Another reading of some valuable MSS. is '72,' instead of 70. The Twelve are multiplied by six. J. Weiss thinks this reading is the older and the truer. He says: 'The despatch of the Twelve to Israel here seems to be multiplied. This remodelling must have taken place at a time when not merely the Twelve, but a number of disciples of the Jewish-Christian community, were preaching the gospel to their fellow-countrymen.' Afterwards the number 72 was corrected to 70 in order to refer to the heathen world. But Luke meant only to speak of a mission to the Jews. Merx takes the same line and view. The S.S. has 72. On the other hand, Loisy, whether we read 70 or 72, holds that Luke's intention is to prefigure the mission to the Gentiles. In either case the number is purely symbolic, proportioned to the catholic destinies of Christianity. It is true the 70 or 72 are not sent to the Gentiles, but this is because tradition could not so far be violated as to attribute to Jesus in his lifetime the intention to evangelize the heathen. All the same the 70 or 72 prefigure the Christian preachers to the world at large, and Samaria, the land whither they are supposed to carry the Gospel, represents the Gentile world. To the Jews the Samaritans were rather heathens than schismatic Israelites, and therefore Luke, or the redactor of one of his sources, likes to show Jesus and his apostles in relations with them (*E. S.* I. p. 858). So too Holtzmann. It is true that it is not definitely stated that the places whither the 70 are to go include the cities and villages of Samaria. Perhaps we are intentionally led to infer this only, so as not to violate the historical reality. Loisy regards it as possible that the 'symbolic intention' is due to a 'first redactor,' and that the Evangelist really took it all literally, and supposed that the 70 were like the Twelve, sent to the Jews only. This second hypothesis seems to me less likely than his first.

At first the disciples are regarded less as missionaries than as harbingers of Jesus's own arrival in the various localities on the journey to Jerusalem. But this point of view is only indicated in verse 1; afterwards they are pure missionaries.

1. Luke only.

2. *Cp.* Matt. ix. 37, 38.

3. *Cp.* Matt. x. 16.

4. The variant of ix. 3. *Cp.* Matt. x. 10.

5, 6. *Cp.* Matt. x. 11–13. In 5 the reading of the S.S. is: 'In whatever house ye first enter, say, &c.,' *i.e.* enter any house which comes first.

7–12. Luke expands material which is also used in Matt. x. 7, 8, 10, 14, 15. *Cp.* Luke ix. 4, 5; Mark vi. 10, 11.
In 5–7 they enter a house and eat there; in 8–11 they enter a city and eat there. Apparently the two statements reflect the earlier and more private preaching in houses, and the later and more public preaching out of doors.

8. They are apparently not to scruple to eat food which according to the Jewish Law is illegal, *e.g.* rabbit or meat cooked in milk. All this assumes later events and Pauline preaching among the heathen. It is peculiar to Luke. *Cp.* 1 Cor. x. 27.

9. 'The Kingdom of God hath come nigh unto you' (*cp.* Matt. x. 7). This seems to mean: the Kingdom is beginning upon earth, even if you reject the apostles. The only result of your rejection is that you will not benefit by, or participate in, the Kingdom. The Kingdom is already present, and is about to show itself to, or be realized among, you, if you show receptivity. But if rejected, then all that can be said is that the Kingdom has been near you (but will not now be granted to you). *Cp.* verse 11. I doubt whether the meaning can also be that 'the disciples are to proclaim the intended coming of Jesus himself, who brings the Kingdom; entrance into it depends on whether he is received' (W.). Has not the personal coming of Jesus faded from view since verse 1? 'Note that in 11 there is no ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ('to you') after ἤγγικεν ('drawn near'). The message of mercy has become a sentence of judgment. The Kingdom has come nigh, but not to you, because you have put it from you' (Plummer). So too Loisy.

13–15. The denunciation of the Galilæan cities finds another place in Matthew (xi. 21–23). It is out of place here.

16. *Cp.* ix. 40; Matt. x. 40, xviii. 5; Mark ix. 37.

17-20. THE RETURN OF THE DISCIPLES

(Luke only)

17 And the seventy returned with joy, saying, 'Lord, even the
18 demons became subject unto us in thy name.' And he said unto
19 them, 'I beheld Satan fall as lightning from heaven. Behold,
I have given unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions,
and over all the power of the enemy: and in nothing shall it injure
20 you at all. Notwithstanding in this rejoice not, that the spirits
are subject unto you; but rejoice that your names are written in
heaven.'

17 is the variant to ix. 10. *Cp.* Mark vi. 30. 'The demons became subject unto us in thy name'; that is, through the use, or invocation, of thy name.

18 is very peculiar. Elsewhere Jesus is not reported as having visions. The fall of Satan means the inauguration of the rule of Messiah; the advent of the Kingdom. 'The ministry of Jesus in Luke is represented as a kind of warfare between the powers of good and evil' (Carpenter).

The interpretation of the verse is an amusing illustration of the immense difficulty of arriving at any certain conclusion as to what Jesus said or did not say. It illustrates the unavoidable subjectivity of the commentators. To J. Weiss the verse is most *à propos*. It suits *his* theory exactly. The mind of Jesus is filled with divine assurance that it is he who is to destroy the devil's kingdom and to inaugurate upon earth the Kingdom of God. He is no mere teacher but a prophet, a prophet who knows visions and ecstasies. His thought is intensely eschatological. There is thus not 'the least reason to deny' that he had a vision such as is here described. And the verse is undoubtedly authentic: it carries 'in seiner unerfindbaren Eigenart den Stempel der Echtheit.' Whereas to W. the verse even as a record of a vision is 'too dry and incomplete.' Moreover, Jesus is no visionary. The isolated verse is 'quite apocryphal.' It is certainly apocryphal, because it does not suit W.'s interpretation of Jesus's character. It is certainly authentic because it suits the interpretation of Weiss. Loisy is on W.'s side. For to him the whole mission of the Seventy is unhistoric and symbolic, and it is arbitrary to suppose that the saying alludes to a vision which Jesus had on another occasion. The passage really has in view the future, the ultimate triumph of the Christian teaching (*E. S.* I. p. 904). Spitta suggests a quite different explanation. He thinks

Jesus means that he saw Satan rushing down with lightning speed from heaven in order to combat the work of the Seventy. Nevertheless he shall not succeed. This seems unlikely. Spitta thinks the saying is authentic (*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, IX. p. 162).

20. The disciples are not to attach too much importance to the subjection of the demons. Rather are they to rejoice in their being enrolled as citizens of the heavenly Kingdom. The Kingdom of God is now conceived as soon to be realized on earth, and now as already existing in heaven. 'Die Bürgerliste des Gottesreichs auf Erden ist zugleich die himmlische Bürgerliste' (W.).

21, 22. THE FATHER AND THE SON

(*Cp.* Matt. xi. 25–27)

21 In that hour Jesus rejoiced in the Holy Spirit, and said, 'I praise thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and the clever, and hast revealed them unto the simple. Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in
22 thy sight. All was delivered unto me by my Father: and no man knoweth who the Son is, except the Father; and who the Father is, except the Son, and him to whom the Son would reveal him.'

These verses have been fully dealt with in the notes on Matthew. Luke's introduction is to be noted. Jesus is distinctly said to be inspired by the Holy Spirit in his joy and also in the words which he says.

23, 24. THE HAPPY EYE-WITNESSES

(*Cp.* Matt. xiii. 16, 17)

23 And he turned unto the disciples, and said privately, 'Happy
24 are the eyes which see what ye see: for I say unto you, that many prophets and kings have desired to see what ye see, and have not seen; and to hear what ye hear, and have not heard.'

24. What the disciples see is the advent of the Messiah. For this prophets and kings (David, Hezekiah and Josiah) had yearned in vain. Loisy regards these verses as authentic. To mark their contrast with, or to distinguish them the better from, what precedes, Luke provides them with a special introduction. They are specially addressed to the disciples and appertain to them. Probably these were the only words which the original redaction

of the Logia (Q) connected with the return of the disciples (*E. S.* I. p. 912).

25–37. The Acquisition of Eternal Life and the Good Samaritan

(*Cp.* Mark xii. 28–34; Matt. xxii. 34–40)

25 And, behold, a teacher of the Law came forward and tempted
26 him, saying, 'Master, what must I do to inherit eternal life?' He
said unto him, 'What is written in the Law? how readest thou?'
27 And he answered and said, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God
with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength,
28 and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself.' And he
said unto him, 'Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou
shalt live.'

29 But he, desiring to justify himself, said unto Jesus, 'And who
30 is my neighbour?' And Jesus answered, saying, 'A man went
down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves, who
stripped him, and beat him, and departed, leaving him half dead.
31 And by chance a priest came down that way: and he saw him,
32 and passed by. And likewise a Levite came to that place, and he
33 too saw, and passed by. But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed,
34 came where he was: and he saw and had compassion. And he
went up to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring on oil and
wine, and set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn,
35 and took care of him. And on the morrow he took out two pieces
of silver, and gave them to the innkeeper, and said unto him,
Take care of him; and whatever thou spendest more, when I come
36 back again, I will repay thee. Which now of these three, thinkest
thou, was a neighbour unto him that fell among the thieves?'
37 And he said, 'The one that shewed him pity.' Then said Jesus
unto him, 'Go, and do thou likewise.'

The famous parable of the good Samaritan, which is only found in Luke, occurs as a sort of appendix to a story which corresponds with the story in Mark and Matthew of 'the greatest commandment.'

25. 'Tempted him' as in Matthew: the original meaning was more probably, 'putting him to the test.'

The Rabbi does not ask, as in Mark and Matthew, 'which is the greatest commandment?' but what he must do to obtain eternal life. (So in the story of the young man with great possessions, Mark x. 17; Matt. xix. 16; Luke xviii. 18.) It may be, as B. Weiss thinks, that the change is due to Luke thinking that his Gentile readers would not be interested in a merely legal question. The ultimate meaning is much the same.

26, 27. In Mark and Matthew Jesus gives the answer himself; in Luke he elicits it from the Rabbi.

28. Jesus commends the Rabbi for his answer, and says to him, not harshly, 'This do and thou shalt live.' Nevertheless in the next verse the Rabbi is represented in a somewhat unfavourable light, as unsatisfied, and his reply (Luke only) gives the opportunity for Jesus to explain the true meaning of a commandment which he (the Rabbi) had repeated with his lips, but had not really understood in its depth and purity. It is clear that this addition falsifies the original story which is given in Mark. Luke, too, though in a different way from Matthew, is glad to depreciate the Rabbi. He is glad to hook on the parable of the good samaritan to the story of the greatest commandment in such a way as not only to give it a convenient place, but to attack the Scribes into the bargain. All is fair in love and party warfare.

29. 'Desiring to justify himself.' Apparently this means that he wanted to excuse himself; the matter was not so simple after all, for though he knows the verse in Leviticus well enough, the question is, Who is my neighbour? How widely must the term be stretched? Whom must it include?

M. Loisy does not think this explanation will hold. He says to 'justify himself' must mean 'pour se faire valoir et démontrer qu'il est un juste.' The other explanation 'would be quite out of harmony with the intention attributed to him at the beginning of the narrative. The scribe means that the direction to cultivate charity is misplaced, as far as he is concerned, because he has always carried out the precept, and he asks who is the neighbour towards whom he has been backward. He is then put to confusion and his ignorance of true charity exposed to him by the revelation of an ideal of which he had no suspicion' (*E. S.* II. p. 353). M. Loisy first published the chapter on 'Le Grand Commandement' in the *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses.* He then admitted that even his own explanation of 'desiring to justify himself' was forced and awkward. The reason is that the question was never really asked. It is a mere redactor's tag. 'If the question seems awkward and ill-placed, if its meaning is not clearly stated, it is because it did not originate from the historical situation described in the narrative, but from a device of the redactor to establish a connection between an anecdote and a parable which were independent of one another by origin.' This sentence is not—to my thinking, unfortunately—repeated in the commentary. Loisy, however, admits that the parable existed at first quite independently of the story of the greatest commandment. On the question whether and how far the teaching of the parable goes beyond the teaching of Rabbinic Judaism, see Additional Note 54.

30. Clearly Luke wanted to use the parable which he found in his sources (to B. Weiss, L). But though 29 is constructed as a peg for it, the parable does not really fit in with the Rabbi's question. For the answer to the question should be: 'Anybody is your neighbour who needs your love; even though he be a Samaritan.' The neighbour should be the *object* of the action. Instead of which the parable is an answer to the question, 'Whose neighbour am I?' In the parable, that is, the neighbour is the *subject* of the action, the man who helps, not (as he should be) the man who needs help. In other words, the Jew ought to help the Samaritan; not the Samaritan the Jew. In the parable the neighbour is the man who shows pity and love, and it is implied (*a*) that such neighbourly deeds must not be limited by race or station, (*b*) that the neighbour is not the man who is related to you by ties of blood, but the man who shows you love. Yet it may also be said that the Samaritan puts the Jews to shame, for he knows the meaning of 'neighbour' better than the Jews. The Jew is in need of his help; therefore the Jew is his neighbour. In fact, from one point of view, 'your neighbour' is the man who shows you love; from another, 'your neighbour' is the man whose need demands that you should show love to him. If the parable was originally connected with the question of the Rabbi, one must suppose, with J. Weiss, that the form of 36 has been modified. It would suit the Rabbi's question if it was said in 36, 'Which of the three treated the wounded man as his neighbour?' For then the neighbour is the object. And yet the story would also fit in with that question.

M. Loisy is worth hearing: 'If the parable is considered apart from the context, the moral of the story is that people despised by the Jews may be much better than they and much nearer to the Kingdom of heaven. They have therefore the right to be treated as brothers, like the children of Israel. The Samaritans, as such, are not put above the priests and Levites; but it is made clear that a charitable Samaritan is worth more than a priest without charity; it is disinterested charity which is meritorious in God's eyes and ought to be so in the eyes of men; no privilege of birth or position can fill its place; a benevolent Samaritan is worthy of the heavenly kingdom, a selfish priest is not....The conclusion of the parable, which does not correspond with the question put by the Jewish doctor need have been but very slightly touched up. Perhaps it was already formulated interrogatively thus: Which of the three appears to you nearest to the kingdom of God, or most worthy of eternal life?

'The second question of the doctor: "And who is my neighbour?" was conceived expressly to serve as a transition and to lead up to the parable. It was not desired that this Jew should of himself understand true charity; hence Jesus teaches him who his 'neighbour' is, and that the Samaritans have this character, and even that they exercise that perfect charity of which the doctor was ignorant. The presence of the Samaritan in the narrative determined this adaptation of the parable and its conjunction with the history of the preaching of the gospel in the country of Samaria. The combination is that of the writer who has displaced and transformed the history of Jesus preaching at Nazareth, who has also interpreted the evangelisation of the Gentiles in the mission of the Seventy-two, and typified the anathemas pronounced upon the towns of Galilee to mean the general reprobation of Israel; for him the Jewish doctor represents Judaism, with which Jewish Christianity is more or less confused, and the Samaritan represents real, that is universal, Christianity' (*E. S.* II. pp. 355, 357).

34. To wash wounds with wine as well as oil is, it appears, true to medical custom in antiquity. See Harnack, *Lukas der Arzt* (following Hobart), p. 132.

36. Which was the 'neighbour' to the unfortunate man?—*i.e.* the 'neighbour' is the 'subject,' not, as in the command, the 'object' of the loving action.

The section is supposed by W., as well as Loisy, to be placed by Luke at this point of his Gospel because Jesus is passing through Samaria. But the *locale* of the parable 'between Jerusalem and Jericho' suits best for a Jerusalem audience. The parallel story in Mark (xii. 28–34) is spoken in Jerusalem.

It is, however, very doubtful whether in the original parable as spoken by Jesus the good man was a Samaritan at all. It is highly probable that in the original parable the three men were Priest, Levite and Israelite; not 'Priest, Levite and Samaritan.' It was the great scholar Halévy who put forward this view in

1882, and although his arguments have been utterly ignored by Christian scholars, they seem to me extremely forcible.

I pass by Halévy's doubt whether Jesus would have made a Samaritan a hero of charity. Matt. x. 5 makes this not over-probable, but it might be said that a Samaritan hero would be all the more suitable for Jesus's purpose. But the chief arguments are quite different.

(1) How could a Samaritan be passing and repassing between Jericho and Jerusalem? As Halévy says: 'La haine entre ces deux peuples était telle qu'ils n'avaient aucun rapport entre eux. Un grave interdit pesait sur toutes les denrées d'origine samaritaine, et coupa court à toute transaction commerciale. Juifs et Samaritains ne mangeaient jamais ensemble et se refusaient mutuellement l'hospitalité.' How, then, could a Samaritan be found between Jerusalem and Jericho, and be on good terms with the landlord of an inn?

(2) The collocation of Priest, Levite and Samaritan is to Jewish ears extremely absurd. Israelite, Samaritan; such a contrast is reasonable. Priest, Levite and Samaritan is no less queer and impossible than 'Priest, Deacon and Frenchman' would be to us to-day. On the other hand, Priest, Levite and Israelite is a frequent and usual collocation. The word 'Israelite' was commonly used to mean a man who was neither Priest nor Levite (like our word 'layman'). So we might say, 'Priest, Deacon and Layman.'

(3) 'La pointe de la parabole vient de cette opposition: le prêtre et le lévite qui vivent des dons des pèlerins, et qui devraient donner l'exemple de la charité au commun du peuple, abandonnent sans pitié un pauvre pèlerin blessé sur une route déserte.' A simple Israelite saves him. This meaning of Israelite as equalling non-Priest, non-Levite, so familiar to Jewish readers, was incomprehensible to the Gentile Christians for whom Luke used the parable. To them Priest and Levite were also Israelites, and so the third man could not be Israelite too. Hence the correction of Ἰσραηλίτης (Israelite) into Σαμαρείτης (Samaritan), 'et cette correction fut accueillie d'autant plus favorablement qu'elle donnait satisfaction à un besoin réel, celui de rattacher à Jésus l'idée de la supériorité des Chrétiens païens sur les Juifs non-convertis' (*Revue des Études Juives*, IV. pp. 249–255).

Whether, however, the Samaritan was original to the parable or not, at all events he is there now. The conception of the good Samaritan is one which the world will not easily let go. And rightly. For the parable is one of the simplest and noblest among the noble gallery of parables in the Synoptic Gospels. Love, it tells us, must know no limits of race and ask no enquiry. Who needs me is my neighbour. Whom at the given time and place I can help with my active love, he is my neighbour and I am his. If the grudging Jewish critic should still seek to argue that even this parable, though 'true' is not (as regards the Old Testament) 'new,' he must surely admit that the exact parallels to it in that book are very few. Nor can he deny that nowhere in the Old Testament parallels is the doctrine so exquisitely and dramatically taught. No sensible and impartial person would wish to deny the excellence of such commands as Exodus xxii. 21, xxiii. 4, but why should we not also gladly welcome and use a parable which can appeal with such power to the heart and imagination of young and old as the parable of the good Samaritan?

38–42. MARY AND MARTHA

(Luke only)

38 Now it came to pass, in the course of their journeying, that he
entered into a certain village: and a woman named Martha
39 received him into her house. And she had a sister called Mary,
who seated herself at the feet of the Lord, listening to his words.
40 But Martha was agitated about all the service, and she came up to
Jesus, and said, 'Lord, dost thou not care that my sister has left the
41 serving to me alone? Tell her, then, to help me.' And Jesus
answered and said unto her, 'Martha, Martha; [thou art anxious
42 and troubled about many things: of one thing (only) there is
need:] Mary hath chosen the good part, from which she must not
be drawn away.'

After the lesson of the good Samaritan, the story of Martha and Mary may be intended to show that the next duty after the love of one's neighbour is that of listening to the Gospel: after charity comes faith. Loisy thinks that under the figures of the two women Luke may intend also to represent Jewish and Gentile Christianity according to their respective characters and in their relation to each other. In the regard which Jesus shows to Mary may be indicated 'la concession absolue du salut aux Gentils' through faith. Whether the story has any historic basis is uncertain. It probably was taken from the same source as ix. 51–56, and may in that source have immediately succeeded that passage. So both Loisy and B. Weiss (*Quellen*, A, p. 208). It may be 'un pur symbole, conçu d'après le tableau des deux sœurs, Israel et Juda, au livre d'Ézéchiel' (*E. S.* II. p. 105).

38. Martha seems to be the 'Hausfrau'; perhaps a widow. Mary is probably unmarried.

40. Martha was distracted and bothered about the service. Apparently this means that she was anxious to give the preacher a fine reception and a good dinner.

41, 42. The text is uncertain, but the original may have been: 'Martha, Martha, thou art anxious and troubled about much (*i.e.* much and various food and elaborate entertainment), but I need few things'—*i.e.* my wants are few. The first correction of the text may have made it assume the form which the oldest MSS. have now: 'but I need, or, there is need of, few things or one thing,' but 'one thing' for 'very little' seems strange. Probably the 'one thing' which the compiler of that text, if he really added the words ἢ ἑνός, meant, was not a part of the many things, not food or entertainment, but something spiritual, God's Word, or the like. Finally, to suit this interpretation the word 'few' was omitted, so that the reading became: 'of One thing only there is need,' and this would become identical with that spiritual 'good portion' which Mary had chosen for herself—hearing the gospel and the good tidings of the Kingdom. But the S.S. has only 'Martha, Martha, Mary has chosen the good part' &c., and both W. and J. Weiss think that this shortest form of the first half of the verse is the most original. The latter scholar thinks that the additions may have been, first: 'You trouble yourself about much, but (only) of one thing is there need,' and then secondly, a variant, 'You trouble about much, but little is needful.' The first of these had a spiritual meaning; the second a material one: my needs are few. Then, lastly, these two variants were combined into the text; 'little is necessary, or rather, one thing only.' Mary's choice (to be wholly immersed in the teaching of Jesus, wholly occupied in thinking of, and preparing for, the Kingdom) is better than being troubled with outward concerns. Thus not only outward charity (x. 30–36) is necessary; but also inward devotion. The active and the contemplative life are both requisite. The last four words of the verse should apparently be translated, not as in A.V. and R.V., but thus: 'from which she must not (or shall not) be drawn away': from the good portion which she has chosen, *i.e.* from her conduct in listening to the Word of God, she must not be drawn away, hindered or disturbed.

CHAPTER XI

1–13. On Prayer

(*Cp.* Matt. vi. 9–13, vii. 7–11)

1 And it came to pass, that, as he was praying in a certain place, when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, 'Lord, teach
2 us to pray, as John too taught his disciples.' And he said unto them, 'When ye pray, say, Father, hallowed be thy name. Thy
3, 4 kingdom come. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we ourselves forgive all who are in debt to us. And lead us not into temptation.'

5 And he said unto them, 'If one of you have a friend, and go unto him at midnight, and say unto him, Friend, lend me three
6 loaves; for a friend of mine hath come on his journey to me, and
7 I have nothing to set before him. Will he from within answer and say, Trouble me not: the door is already shut, and my children are with me in bed; I cannot rise and give to thee.
8 I say unto you, Even if he will not rise and give to him because he is his friend, yet because of his importunity he will rise and give him as much as he needeth.

9 'And I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and
10 ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to
11 him that knocketh it shall be opened. If a son shall ask for bread from any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if he
12 ask for a fish, will he give him a serpent? or if he ask for an egg,
13 will he give him a scorpion? If then ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more will your Father from heaven give of the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?'

1. 'The disciples make their request because they see Jesus praying, and because they do not want to be inferior to the disciples of John who already possessed a special prayer of their Master's. Both reasons can easily be combined, but it would seem that the first was added later. The disciples of John have a priority, as in fasting and baptism, so also in prayer. It is acknowledged that fasting only became prevalent among the disciples of Jesus after his death: the same thing will have been the case as regards prayer. The passage reflects a time in which the disciples, and no longer the two Masters, stand over against each other. In Matt. vi. the Lord's Prayer is a later addition; Mark is ignorant of it' (W.). Loisy is keen that prayer and setting are alike historical. 'Le fait même de la demande adressée à Jésus est une donnée qui ne pouvait se déduire de la prière, et qu'un historien du Christ aurait eu plutôt la tentation d'omettre que de supposer' (*E. S.* I. p. 599).

It was customary for a famous Rabbi to make up a special prayer. A number of these special prayers which in the Talmud are attributed to particular Rabbis became part of the regular liturgy.

The Lord's Prayer is slightly shorter in Luke than in Matthew, and the wording is not quite the same. For 'Thy Kingdom come' some old church fathers read: 'Thy Holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us.' *Cp.* verse 13. The shorter form in Luke is doubtless more original than the form in Matthew. Whether even his form goes back to Jesus is doubtful. It may, as Pfleiderer says, represent a gradual putting together and stereotyped fixing of prayer formulæ and phrases which Jesus may often have used. That there is no reference or allusion to the prayer in Mark, Paul or the Apocalypse makes it very doubtful whether it can have served already in the apostolic community as the regular form of prayer (*Urchristentum*, I. p. 439).

4. The *γάρ* ('for') is rather awkward. The meaning is not: 'forgive us *because* we have forgiven.' But rather: we may ask you to forgive us, for we have forgiven others. We have fulfilled the needful condition.

5–8. These verses with their quaint parable are peculiar to Luke. *Cp.* xviii. 1–8.

8. 'Because of his importunity'; the Greek word is even stronger: *ἀναιδία*, literally, shamelessness. From one point of view much, at any rate, long, prayer is idle (Matt. vi. 7); from another, importunate prayer is urged The two injunctions are not necessarily inconsistent; yet the former seems to-day the more acceptable to us.

How simple and unphilosophic Jesus's conception of God must have been. People sometimes sneer at the 'Jewish' conception of the 'external' God—a God, who is just a 'person' like ourselves, separate from us and from the world. Such a God was undoubtedly the God of Jesus, a far simpler God probably than the God of the author of Psalm cxxxix. (*cp.* Prof. W. James, *A Pluralistic Universe*, p. 111). But yet He was a very 'near' God all the same. And so He was and is very near, even though 'external,' to most old-fashioned Jews.

9–13. This section, like the Lord's Prayer 2–4, occurs in Matthew in the Sermon on the Mount.

13. Luke changes the 'good things' of Matthew (vii. 11) to 'Holy Spirit.' The real essence of all Christian prayer should be a request for the reception of the Holy Spirit. But the S.S. reads (as Matt. vii. 11) that God will give 'good things.' This may be original. The Holy Spirit may be a later change due, as Merx thinks, to Marcion. A fine and notable change, in that case, depending upon a fine idea. There is some evidence that the second petition in the Lord's Prayer in Luke read according to some authorities, 'Thy Spirit come' instead of 'Thy Kingdom.' Some think that the use of the 'Holy Spirit' in verse 13 confirms its use in the prayer. But W. points out that xi. 5–13 is a kind of variant of xviii. 1–8. In the second passage the object of Christian prayer is judgment and revenge, that is, in other words, the advent of the Kingdom in one of its aspects and results. The Parousia, thus regarded, seemed un-Christian because it was a day of vengeance upon enemies. Hence the Holy Spirit was substituted for the Kingdom. While it may be quite true that 'the Kingdom' is more original than 'the Spirit' in the prayer, I doubt the value of W.'s argumentation. I doubt whether at any time it seemed un-Christian to pray for the Judgment and for the destruction of all foes of the Church. It is one thing to forgive, pray for and 'love' one's private enemies, and one's enemies in the abstract; it is quite another to object to the destruction and damnation of the foes of religion and of God (*i.e.* the foes of one's own particular creed). Have any Christians ever objected, did Jesus himself ever actually object, to this? Did Jesus ever pray for the salvation of the Pharisees? Did he not rather anticipate their final destruction on the Judgment Day? Jesus and the Church fell upon just the same stumbling-block as the Rabbis and the synagogue. As regards the attitude of both to the deliberate enemies of their religion, it is six of one and half a dozen of the other.

14–26. JESUS AND BEELZEBUL

(*Cp.* Mark iii. 22–30; Matt. xii. 22–30, 43–45)

14 And he cast out a demon, and it was dumb. And it came to
pass, when the demon had gone out, the dumb man spoke; and
15 the people marvelled. But some of them said, 'He casts out
16 demons through Beelzebul the lord of the demons.' And others,
17 tempting him, demanded from him a sign from heaven. But he,
knowing their thoughts, said unto them, 'Every kingdom divided
18 against itself is ruined, and one house falleth upon another. If
Satan also be divided against himself, how can his kingdom
endure? because ye say that I cast out the demons through
19 Beelzebul. And if I by Beelzebul cast out demons, by whom do
your sons cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges.
20 But if I through the finger of God cast out the demons, then the
21 kingdom of God hath already come unto you. When a strong
22 man armed guardeth his palace, his goods are in peace: but when
a stronger than he cometh upon him, and conquereth him, he
taketh from him all his armour wherein he trusted, and divideth
23 his spoils. He that is not with me is against me: and he that
gathereth not with me scattereth.

24 'When the unclean spirit has gone out of a man, it walks
through waterless places, seeking rest; and finding none, it says,
25 I will return unto my house whence I went out. And when it
26 has entered, it finds it swept and garnished. Then it goes and
takes with it seven other spirits more wicked than itself; and
they enter in, and dwell there: and the last state of that man
becomes worse than the first.'

Here Luke mainly follows the special source (Q) which was used by both him and Matthew. He had omitted Mark's account of the matter in iii. 22–30. Matthew combined Mark and Q.

16. This verse prepares the way for xi. 29. Its parallel in Matthew is xii. 38.

20. Matthew has 'through the Spirit of God': for this Luke substitutes 'through the finger of God.'

24–26 seem more suitably placed here than in Matthew.

27, 28. Jesus and his Mother

(Luke only)

27 And it came to pass, as he spoke these words, a woman from the crowd lifted up her voice, and said unto him, 'Happy is the womb that bore thee, and the breasts which thou hast sucked.'
28 But he said, 'Yea, but happy rather are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.'

These verses are a variant of Mark iii. 31–35, already given in viii. 19–21. They may be the creation of Luke or included by him from some other source. *Cp. E. S.* I. pp. 724, 725. It may be noticed that no disrespect to Mary is intended; on the contrary, Luke tends to magnify her position and importance. It is not said that she is not happy to have Jesus for her son, but that still more happy are they who receive the gospel and maintain it. B. Weiss thinks that the two verses are taken from L.

Physical relationship to the Master is not the highest relationship. Most blessed are they who listen to the word of God, which he teaches, and perform it. However correct this may be, there is a certain depreciation of the most sacred of human relationships which is out of harmony with Jewish feeling. Verses of this kind would, I fancy, be impossible in a purely Jewish book.

28. *μενοῦν.* We may either render as above, or, 'Nay, rather.' The note of J. Weiss is suggestive. Jesus's reply has not quite the same signification as his saying about his true relations. 'He does not mean merely that physical relationship signifies nothing to him in comparison with spiritual community in doing the will of God; here he puts aside the feminine enthusiasm, coloured with sensuousness, which can imagine nothing more blessed than to stand in a near personal relation to him. Notice again the prominence of feminine sentiment.'

29–32. The Sign of Jonah

(*Cp.* Matt. xii. 38–42)

29 And when a crowd of people was gathered together, he began to say, 'This generation is a wicked generation: it seeketh a sign; and no sign shall be given it but the sign of Jonah the prophet.
30 For as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the
31 Son of man be to this generation. The queen of the south shall

appear as accuser of this generation, and condemn it: for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon;
32 and, behold, more than Solomon is here. The men of Nineve shall appear as accusers of this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and, behold, more than Jonah is here.

30. The question whether Luke knew, but suppressed Matt. xii. 40 has been alluded to in the notes on Matthew. Holtzmann thinks that Matt. xii. 40 is a later insertion, and that the sign of Jonah is the fact that the Ninevites repented. W., on the other hand, thinks that the sign had nothing to do with the Ninevites' repentance (which is a separate argument and cannot be called a sign). The sign is rightly interpreted, he thinks, by Matt. xii. 40, a verse omitted by Luke because he presumably objected to the use made of the whale and its belly. The fact, too, that, in Luke, 32 does not follow 30, but is preceded by 31 W. regards as an extra support to his interpretation. It may also be noted that Luke does not say that Jesus *is* a sign, but that he *will be* a sign. Hence his preaching could not be the sign intended.

33–36. Similes about Light

(*Cp.* Matt. v. 15, vi. 22, 23)

33 'No man, when he hath lighted a lamp, putteth it in a secret place, or under the bushel, but on the lampstand, that they who
34 come in may see the light. The lamp of the body is thine eye: when thine eye is single, thy whole body is light; but when thine
35 eye is bad, thy body also is dark. Take heed, then, that the light
36 in thee be not darkness. If, then, thy whole body be light, having no part dark, it will be wholly light, as when the lamp with its bright shining doth give thee light.'

33. No connection seems possible between 32 and 33, and between 33 and 34 there seems merely the verbal connection of the word 'lamp.' The parallels in Matthew occur in the Sermon on the Mount.

36. The literal translation of this verse gives a poor and tautologous sense. It is probably corrupt. Merx, after a minute examination of the textual evidence, gives the following as the original of 35 and 36. 'The lamp of the body is the eye. When

thine eye is single, thy whole body too is light. When thine eye is bad, thy body too is dark. Look to it, then, lest the light in thee be dark. If the light in thee be dark, how great the darkness.' Jesus is speaking of the internal light; the light of the soul. If the soul be dark, great is the darkness.

37–54. AGAINST THE PHARISEES

(*Cp.* Matt. xxiii.)

37 And as he spoke, a Pharisee asked him to dine with him: and
38 he went in, and sat down to table. And the Pharisee wondered
39 when he saw that he had not first washed before dinner. But the
Lord said unto him, 'Now ye Pharisees cleanse the outside of the
cup and the dish; but your inward part is full of extortion and
40 wickedness. Ye fools, doth not he that cleaneth that which is
41 inward clean that which is outward also? But rather cleanse what
is within, and, behold, all things are clean unto you.

42 'But woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye pay tithe from mint and
rue and all manner of herbs, and neglect justice and the love of
God: these ought ye to do, though not to leave the other undone.
43 Woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye love the first seats in the
44 synagogues and greetings in the market-places. Woe unto you,
for ye are as graves which are not seen, so that men walk over
them without knowing it.'

45 Then answered one of the teachers of the Law, and said unto
46 him, 'Master, in speaking thus thou insultest us also.' But he
said, 'Woe unto you also, ye teachers of the Law; for ye lade men
with burdens grievous to be borne, and yourselves touch not the
47 burdens with one of your fingers. Woe unto you! for ye build the
48 tombs of the prophets, and your fathers killed them. Thus ye bear
witness and consent to the deeds of your fathers: for they killed
49 them, and ye build their tombs. Therefore also the Wisdom of
God said, I will send them prophets and apostles, and some of them
50 they will slay and persecute: that the blood of all the prophets,
which hath been shed from the foundation of the world, may be
51 required from this generation; from the blood of Abel unto the
blood of Zacharias, who perished between the altar and the temple:
yea I say unto you, It shall be required from this generation.

52 Woe unto you, ye teachers of the Law, for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye have not entered in yourselves, and those who wanted to enter in ye have prevented.'

53 And when he had departed thence, the scribes and the Pharisees began to press him urgently, and to question him about
54 many things, laying wait for him to catch something out of his mouth.

This long tirade corresponds roughly with Matt. xxiii., where Jesus speaks it at Jerusalem in the Temple. Here, far less suitably, he makes the speech on his journey, at table as a guest of a Pharisee. It would have been the height of discourtesy to make such a speech on such an occasion. The interjection of the Scribe at 45 is even milder than the occasion would have demanded. Moreover, the speech demands the presence of a number of Scribes and Pharisees who cannot have all suddenly arrived at the house. The introduction to the speech (verse 38) seems taken from Mark vii. 2, the rest of which chapter is omitted by Luke. To B. Weiss the passage is mainly taken from L. It is in its present form a combination of L and Q. Loisy thinks that Luke put the speech against the Pharisees here because he wanted to make the Jerusalem speeches end up with the apocalyptic oration of Mark. But the last verses (53, 54), in spite of the 'attenuation' which they have undergone, show that in the source the speech was followed by the story of the Passion.

38. One cannot help sympathizing with the Pharisee's wonder. The guest should not offend the host, whatever his opinions may be. Moreover the custom, though an externality, was as much a custom of decency and propriety as of religion. The Rabbis were very keen about decency and cleanliness from a civilized and secular point of view. The maxim, 'These ought ye to have done and not to leave the other undone' (Matt. xxiii. 23 at the end), would have enabled Jesus to wash his hands consistently with his own right principle that the inward *precedes* the outward. The inward cannot always *include* the outward. No amount of right doing and holy being will make a man's hands physically clean. The dirty saint is a bad creation of Christianity, though by no means all Christian saints objected to cleanliness or despised it. Judaism does not know the dirty saint. 'Cleanliness is next to godliness,' taking cleanliness in quite a secular and unlevitical sense, is not a bad proverb, and in full accordance with Rabbinic spirit.

39. Matt. xxiii. 25. The situation—a meal—makes this beginning very suitable. J. Weiss would like to omit 'cup and

dish' as a gloss, and thus make the contrast lie between the bodily outside, which they are so keen to keep clean, and their dirty souls. This was, and is still, the idea of his father, B. Weiss, who thinks that the words have been inserted from Matt. xxiii. 25. Luke is here quoting L, not Q. So, too, the word ἁρπαγῆς is from Matthew.

It is perhaps needless to add that the charge as applied to the Pharisees as a whole is unhistorical. Yet scholars, who should know better, go on talking as if all the Pharisees were 'actors' and whited sepulchres. So, for instance, does Mr Glover in his last delightful and learned book, *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire.* Mr Glover has many hard things to say of Judaism. Jesus can only be extolled at the expense of the religion of his fathers and contemporaries. The result is that of both Jesus and Judaism very dubious things are said. Did Jesus in very truth 'cut away at once every vestige of the primitive and every savage survival'? Did he not believe in demonic possession? I am not, however, concerned and desirous to weaken a generous enthusiasm, though perhaps it is the fact that it is Mr Glover's lack of familiarity with Jewish literature which makes 'the sheer originality of Jesus' so 'bewildering' to him. But as to his estimate of Judaism a few words may be added. How well he proves his own sagacious words that religions need testing 'in life': but he does not seem to know Jewish life from within. If he did, he would, I think, have written differently. 'It is easy,' as he says, 'to find faults in the religion of other men,' but as he adds, 'it is not so profitable as it seems.' It is also dangerous unless one is well informed. He seems to think that the enactments of the Law were not observed, because it was believed that God, all wise and all holy, ordered them, but as mere emblems of 'patriotism.' A strange misconception! He says: 'The Sabbath, circumcision, the blood and butter taboos remained—as they still remain in the most liberal of Liberal Judaisms—tribe marks with no religious value, but maintained by patriotism' (p. 132). It is strange to hear that the institution of the Sabbath has no religious value. It is erroneous that liberal Judaism still orders the observance of blood and butter taboos. And where they are maintained, it is again erroneous that these 'taboos' are observed from patriotism, and not from religion. But stranger things are said in the next sentence. 'Side by side with this lived *and lives* (italics mine) that hatred of the Gentile, which is attributed to Christian persecution, but which Juvenal saw and noted before the Christian had ceased to be persecuted by the Jew.' But did Juvenal live before Titus? did Juvenal live before Antiochus Epiphanes? The hatred of the Gentile only exists in such Jews who have suffered from Gentile wrong-doing and from Gentile oppression. Mr Glover also states (on the authority of 'a friend to whom a Jew said as much') that '*to this day* it is confessedly the weakness of Judaism that it offers no impulse and knows no enthusiasm for self-sacrificing love where the interests of the tribe are not concerned' (italics mine). What then is the 'impulse' which makes Jews foremost in the support of every general charitable and educational work? Judaism to-day, whether orthodox or liberal, is 'confessedly' universalist, and the 'impulse' for self-sacrificing love which it offers is just this: that God is goodness, that He is the father of all human flesh, and that He bids us imitate His attributes of justice, loving kindness and compassion. There is no Jewish synagogue of whatever shade of opinion where this teaching is not promulgated.

40. The ordinary translation of this verse is given in the Revised Version. 'Did not he that made the outside make the inside also?' You should not merely care to make the outside clean: God made the inward, ethical world too. He made the *heart*, the *soul.*

But this interpretation of the verse seems unlikely. Far better to transpose with W. (following 'D') 'inward' and 'outward,' and to render: 'Has not he (the man) who has cleaned the inward also cleaned the outward?' W. holds that 'make' here means 'clean,' for which he quotes two parallels in the Septuagint.

41. Here, again, W. by means of a brilliant emendation makes excellent sense. The Greek text reads: 'Give for alms what is within the cup,' *i.e.* its contents or equivalent in money, and then 'all' (*i.e.* both the cup and its contents, or the inner man and the outer man) will be clean. But this is an extraordinary idea, and alms seem quite out of place here. W. points out that in Aramaic *zakki* means 'give alms,' while *dakki* means 'cleanse.' The Greek translator misread one letter. Hence W. suggests that we must render: 'Clean what is within, and all is clean to you.' The thought of 40 is repeated in 41. B. Weiss has another explanation, depending on his peculiar conception of the relation of L to Q in this passage. He supposes that *τὰ ἐνόντα* is a gloss suggested by *τὸ ἐντὸς τοῦ ποτηρίου* in Matthew, and added here through misunderstanding. The true meaning is: 'Give alms, and thus show that your inside is free from wicked selfishness, and then no external dirt clinging to your outside can make you unclean.' In 39, deleting some words as an intrusion from Q, he renders: 'Now, you Pharisees, you clean the outside, but your inside is full of wickedness. Did not he who made the

outside (*i.e.* man's outside) also make the inside (*i.e.* man's inward, moral, spiritual nature)?' (*Quellen*, A, p. 263.)

42. Matt. xxiii. 23 with a slightly different and less appropriate choice of words. 'D' omits here the words which occur in Matt. xxiii. 23 *b*; perhaps rightly. Certainly the principle of it ('These ought ye to do, and not to leave the other undone') is opposed to 40 and 41 and to Jesus's practice at the banquet. For 40 says: internal cleanness includes (*i.e.* makes supererogatory) outward cleansing. The extra words in Matthew may be a 'legal' Jewish-Christian interpolation.

43. Matt. xxiii. 6, 7.

44. Matt. xxiii. 27. Men do not realize your inward wickedness, for your outward show is fair. Hence they may unwittingly be harmed by you morally. The change from Matthew is very curious. B. Weiss supposes it is due to this verse being taken from L. It may more probably be due to Luke changing all the details of Matthew which would be unintelligible to readers unacquainted with Jewish customs.

45. A justified interruption from a Scribe. But it is probably made up by Luke to introduce the 'woes' against the 'Scribes' which follow. Yet the next section, 46–52, is really directed, except its first and last verses, against the Jews generally, and not specially against the Scribes.

46. *Cp.* Matt. xxiii. 4. But the wording is oddly varied. B. Weiss accounts for this by holding the verse is taken from L. That it is said of the *νομικοί* is accurate, for it is only they who by their additions to, and explanations of, the Mosaic Law created unbearable burdens (*Quellen*, A, p. 265).

47, 48. Matt. xxiii. 29, 30. The argument is ironical, but the irony is somewhat poor. 'Jésus feint de croire que les scribes, en construisant les tombeaux des prophètes tués par leurs pères, ont l'intention de glorifier les crimes de ceux-ci' (*E. S.* II. p. 383). The change from Matthew's version is again attributed by B. Weiss to the source being L, and not Q.

49–51. Matt. xxiii. 34–36.

49. The words which, in Matthew, Jesus speaks as his own, are here attributed by him to 'the Wisdom of God.' Is this an apocryphal Jewish book? So thinks Holtzmann, but W. thinks

this unlikely, and adds that if Jesus is quoting from a book, it must have been written by a Christian, and after the fall of Jerusalem. Anyway Luke had some scruple to attribute 49–51 to Jesus himself. In Luke's source, says Loisy, 49–51, together with what we now read in xiii. 34, 35, formed the peroration of the whole oration. Luke cut the quotation into two, placed one half of it between the last two 'Woes,' and removed the other half of it to a later chapter. It is even there inappropriately added, but it would be still more inappropriate if uttered, not in the capital itself, a little before the Passion, but at table, in a Pharisee's house, in Galilee or merely on the road to Jerusalem (*E. S.* I. p. 154, II. p. 384).

52. Matt. xxiii. 13. For the 'key of the Kingdom of heaven' Luke has 'the key of knowledge.' He means the same thing. It is the key of knowledge how to enter the Kingdom, as the second part of the verse makes clear. 'The Scribes have, in a certain sense, stolen the key of the Kingdom, which is thus closed, by falsifying the spirit of the Law, and by turning the people away from the penitence which would give them access to God' (*E. S.* II. 373).

53, 54. Luke only. The phraseology is strange. The meaning may be what is given in the translation, but it seems doubtful whether the rendering can be got out of the Greek words *δεινῶς ἐνέχειν* and *ἀποστοματίζειν.* The texts and versions vary. Perhaps the original may have run more like this: 'they were very angry with him, and they argued with him about many things,' &c. Dr Weymouth renders vigorously and suggestively: 'After He had left the house, the Scribes and Pharisees commenced a vehement attempt to entangle Him and make Him give off-hand answers on numerous points, lying in wait to catch some unguarded expression from His lips.'

CHAPTER XII

1–12. THE DISCIPLES ARE TO PROCLAIM CHRIST OPENLY AND FEARLESSLY

(*Cp.* Matt. xvi. 6 [Mark viii. 15], x. 26–33, xii. 32 [Mark iii. 29], x. 19, 20)

1 In the mean time, thousands of people having gathered
together so that they trod upon one another, he began to say
unto his disciples first of all, 'Beware of the leaven, that is the
2 hypocrisy, of the Pharisees. For there is nothing hidden which
shall not be disclosed, or concealed which shall not be known.
3 Therefore whatever ye have spoken in the darkness shall be heard
in the light; and that which ye have spoken in the ear in
4 a chamber shall be proclaimed upon the housetops. But I say
unto you my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and
5 after that can do no more. But I will show you whom ye must
fear: fear him, who after he hath killed hath power to cast into
6 hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him. Are not five sparrows sold
for two pennies? and not one of them is forgotten before God.
7 But even the hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not
therefore: ye are of more value than many sparrows.

8 'I say unto you, Whoever shall acknowledge me before men,
him shall the Son of man also acknowledge before the angels of
9 God: but he that denieth me before men shall be denied before
10 the angels of God. And whoever shall speak a word against the
Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whoever blasphemeth
against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven.

11 'And when they bring you before the synagogues and the
magistrates and authorities, be not anxious how or what ye shall
12 answer, or what ye shall say: for the Holy Spirit will teach you in
that very hour what ye ought to say.'

'Les discours contenus dans le chapitre xii. ne sont qu'un amalgame de sentences empruntées aux Logia, artificiellement réunies en groupes que relient des formules d'introduction conçues avec plus ou moins de bonheur par l'Évangeliste' (*E. S.* I. p. 154).

1. The great crowd is here very unexpected, nor do I find any adequate explanation of it. It is the more peculiar inasmuch as the words of Jesus which follow are intended not for the crowd, but for the disciples, as is distinctly stated. The word *πρῶτον*, 'first,' has been added to smooth over the difficulty. Jesus speaks 'in the first place' to his disciples. The opening words *ἐν οἷς* are intended to connect this section with what precedes. They mean, 'meanwhile,' 'while what has been described was going on.' The initial saying of Jesus is not connected with what follows; it appears to have been placed here by Luke on account of the preceding paragraph having dealt with the Pharisees. Luke interprets the leaven of the Pharisees to be their hypocrisy. *Cp.* Mark viii. 15 and Matt. xvi. 6.

2. The rest of the section jumps off to another subject. Luke may have seen a connection in that the open declaration of faith demanded in 2 is the opposite of the furtive hypocrisy of the Pharisees. *Cp.* Matt. x. 26; Mark iv. 22; Luke viii. 17.

3. *ἀνθ' ὧν.* This expression appears to mean here: 'wherefore.' No other translation makes good sense. The verse corresponds with Matt. x. 27, but there is an important difference. In Matthew Jesus says: 'What I say in darkness (*i.e.* privately), do you repeat in the light' (*i.e.* publicly), but here he says: 'What you say in darkness, will ultimately be proclaimed upon the roof tops.' Apparently Luke seems to have thought that the apostles had not really preached so publicly. 'La publicité de l'Évangile n'est venue que plus tard, si tant est qu'elle ne soit pas réservée à l'avenir.' The apostles spoke at first within the house. (*Cp.* x. 5–7.) Hence the injunction to show fearless courage before all the world is less in place if the apostles had no need to display it (*E. S.* I. p. 887).

4, 5. The small differences here between Matthew (x. 28) and Luke are nevertheless worth noting, for they have a theological interest. They are thus drawn out by M. Loisy (*E. S.* I. p. 888). 'Instead of saying that men cannot kill the soul, he says that men can do no more than kill the body; instead of saying that God can destroy both body and soul in hell, he says that God has power not only to kill, but to throw into hell. One is greatly tempted to think that Luke revised the formulas in view of an anthropology and an eschatology different from those of the source. He did not wish to say that the dead man, before the Resurrection, was a soul without a body, and above all he did not wish to suggest that sinners will not be thrown into hell before the last Judgment; the individual, who must not be pictured as a shade which sleeps till the Resurrection, can be thrown into hell as soon as he leaves this world. The same conception of what awaits men beyond the tomb will be met again in the parable of Lazarus and in the promise of Jesus to the good thief.' *Cp.* also B. Weiss, *Quellen*, p. 80.

8, 9. Matt. x. 32, 33. In 9 the parallel in Mark is viii. 38, already used by Luke in ix. 26. The dispute is still unsettled whether in this verse, be it authentic or not authentic, the Son of man is meant to be distinguished from Jesus. It is true that where Luke has the 'Son of man,' Matthew has 'I.' But here this 'I' is perhaps not an earlier, but a later, stage of development. Luke, who distinguishes between Jesus and the Son of man, may perchance be here earlier than Matthew, who identifies them. Merx also argues that the way in which the angels are here spoken of shows an earlier phase of theological or christological development than the language of Matthew or Mark. For here the angels are judges; the Son of man gives evidence before them. God the Father is substituted for them in Matthew, and the Son of man is on the way to becoming the judge. For another view see the note on Matt. x. 32.

'Before men,' *i.e.* before human tribunals. 'Before the angels of God,' *i.e.* at the last Judgment.

10. Luke suddenly intercalates a verse found in Matthew in quite another connection. Why he does so is not quite clear. Certainly this statement about blaspheming the Holy Spirit stands in a better connection in Mark (iii. 29) and Matthew (xii. 32) than here. For whereas this verse says that any one who speaks against the Son of man (who to the Evangelist meant Jesus) shall be forgiven, it was said in the previous verse that he who denies Jesus before men shall be denied before God. The sin against the Holy Spirit is, according to W., if a disciple deny his Christianity, and if he do not openly declare that which the Spirit urges him to say. *Cp.* note on Matt. xii. 32. But J. Weiss suggests that what is referred to in the second part of verse 10 may be what we find in 12. He who blasphemes the Holy Spirit, speaking from the disciples, shall never be forgiven. In that case 10 perhaps stands in a wrong place, and the suspicion arises that it has been added by a later editor. Or it may have been placed where it now is by Luke as an argument for the encouragement of the disciples.

He who denies Jesus on earth will be rejected at the Judgment, and he who blasphemes those who are his disciples and bear witness to his truth will also be condemned eternally.

11. Luke now returns to a part of the speech which had found an earlier and better place in Matthew (x. 19, 20). It is perhaps hooked on here, as Holtzmann suggests, on account of the occurrence of the words τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα in 10. In the wording the same commentator regards as Pauline reminiscences ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἐξουσίαι ('magistrates and authorities') and the teaching of the Holy Spirit (Eph. iii. 10; 1 Cor. ii. 13).

13–21. Against Covetousness—The Parable of the Rich Fool

(Luke only)

13 And some one from the crowd said unto him, 'Master, tell my
14 brother to divide the inheritance with me.' And he said unto
him, 'Man, who made me a judge or an arbitrator over you?'
15 And he said unto them, 'Take heed, and beware of all
covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance
of the things which he possesseth.'
16 And he spoke a parable unto them, saying, 'The ground of
17 a certain rich man brought forth plentifully: and he argued
within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have no room
18 where to store my crops? And he said, This will I do: I will pull
down my barns, and build bigger ones; and there will I store all
19 my produce and my goods. And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou
hast many goods laid up for many years; rest, eat, drink, and be
20 merry. But God said unto him, Fool, this night they will demand
thy soul from thee: and whose shall be what thou hast prepared?
21 So is it with him who storeth up treasure for himself, and is not
rich toward God.'

B. Weiss shows good reason to hold that this section stood in Q (*Quellen*, A, pp. 78, 81). Loisy thinks the same.

13. The incident is intended by Luke to serve as the peg for the warnings which are to follow. But it must have had an independent origin, for it contains no allusions to covetousness, but a protest by Jesus against being troubled with matters which

do not concern him or come within his competency. He is a religious teacher, who will not, though this may be usual in the East, be occupied with mundane affairs. The 'crowd' is taken from xii. 1.

15. This verse is the redactional link between the incident and the parable. They are independent originally of one another. The Greek wording is awkward and redundant. Dr Plummer translates: 'Not in the fact that a man has abundance is it the case that his life is the outcome of his possessions,' *i.e.* it does not follow, because a man has abundance, that his life consists in wealth. W. translates according to the Syriac: 'Not in superfluity of wealth lies man's life.' A man's life lies outside his possessions. The doctrine taught in this section does not go beyond Psalm xlix. and other Old Testament passages.

20. 'This night.' It is assumed that the man's plan, as sketched in 18, has been carried out. On the very night when all is finished, and he could begin his enjoyment, he dies.

'They will demand,' *i.e.* the angels of death; or an impersonal usage instead of the passive.

21. 'Rich toward God': a strange expression. W. says it means merely 'rich before God,' *i.e.* the man who lays up his treasures in heaven; like xii. 33; Mark x. 21. Holtzmann and others think the phrase means acquiring or using wealth for good purposes, for the glory of God. More probably it refers to almsgiving. The picture in 19 seems based on Sirach xi. 19.

22–32. AGAINST ANXIOUS CARE FOR MUNDANE MATTERS

(*Cp.* Matt. vi. 25–33)

22 And he said unto his disciples, 'Therefore I say unto you, Be
not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat; nor for your body,
23 what ye shall put on. The life is more than the food, and the body
24 than clothing. Observe the ravens: for they neither sow nor reap;
they have neither storehouse nor barn; and God feedeth them:
25 how much more are ye worth than the birds! And which of you
26 by anxious care can add one cubit unto his height? If ye then
cannot do that which is least, why are ye anxious about the rest?
27 Observe the lilies, how they neither spin nor weave; and yet I say
unto you that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of

28 these. If then God so clothe the herbs in the field, which to-day
are, and to-morrow are thrown into the oven; how much more will
29 he clothe you, O ye of little faith? And seek not ye what ye shall
eat, or what ye shall drink, neither be ye troubled with anxiety.
30 For after all these things do the nations of the world seek: and
31 your Father knoweth that ye need these things. But rather seek
ye the kingdom of God; and all these things shall be added unto
32 you. Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure
to give you the kingdom.

Luke here inserts another passage which Matthew has in the Sermon on the Mount. Its position there seems better. For anxious care is there regarded, more properly, as an instance of lack of faith; by its place in Luke it is regarded as a phase of covetousness.

24. For the generic birds in Matthew, Luke has 'the ravens,' which is more probably original.

26. 'About the rest.' Apparently this means all the other things necessary for physical life, besides food.

29. The usage of the Greek word μετεωρίζεσθαι is odd. It seems to mean here, 'be in suspense,' 'be anxious.' I have translated, perhaps rather pleonastically, 'neither be ye troubled with anxiety.'

32. This verse is not in Matthew; it seems to have been added by Luke to make a connection between what has preceded and the next short section 33, 34. 'The fear against which Jesus warns his disciples is no longer any disquietude about earthly wants, nor is it any alarm respecting persecutions, but it is the incertitude which they may feel as regards their participation in the Kingdom.' Jesus says that it is God's will that they shall all enter the Kingdom. Let them (33, 34) only on their part renounce all earthly possessions, and give the proceeds in alms. 'The little flock who have riches to distribute to the poor is not the small group of poor persons (*le groupe très peu fortuné*) who accompanied Jesus in his ministry, but the later Christian community, before whom the redactor puts forward his ideal of renouncement' (*E. S.* I. p. 620).

33, 34. TREASURES IN HEAVEN

(*Cp.* Matt. vi. 19-21)

33 'Sell what ye possess, and give alms; make for yourselves
bags which grow not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth
34 not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth destroyeth. For
where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.

This section is also found, though in another connection, in the Sermon on the Mount. Luke makes considerable changes. He makes Matthew's more general injunctions more definite. But the meaning is probably much the same in both versions. Matthew also implies that the earthly treasures had better be dispersed by almsgiving. Luke, however, urges a more complete renouncement, and leaves no doubt as to the value he sets upon almsgiving. As to the right position of the passage see notes on Matthew. To B. Weiss the explanation of the peculiar wording of the passage is that it is mainly taken from L (*Quellen*, A, p. 239). It may be noted that the order to the disciples to sell their goods is meant literally. For Dr Plummer is surely not right in saying that here, too, as in vi. 29, 30, 'We have a rule given, not that it may be kept literally, but that it may illustrate a principle. So far as attachment to our possessions is concerned, we must be ready to part with them.' This is too milk-and-watery an explanation.

35-40. WATCH: THE LORD COMETH

(*Cp.* Matt. xxiv. 43, 44)

35, 36 'Let your loins be girt, and your lamps burning. And be ye
yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord to return from
the wedding; so that when he cometh and knocketh, they may
37 open unto him immediately. Happy are those servants, whom
the lord when he cometh shall find watching: verily I say unto
you, that he will gird himself, and make them to sit down to table,
38 and will go round and serve them. And if he come in the second
39 or in the third watch, and find them so, happy are they. But
know this, that if the master of the house had known at what hour
the thief would come, he would not have allowed his house to be
40 broken into. So be ye too ready: for at an hour when ye do not
expect it, the Son of man will come.'

35. To Loisy it is 'souverainement invraisemblable' that Luke xii. 35, 36 and xiii. 25 are more original than Matt. xxv. 1-13 (the parable of the virgins). He regards these verses of Luke as reminiscences and echoes of that parable and of a parable 'des serviteurs vigilants qui faisait pendant à celle des dix jeunes filles' (*E. S.* II. pp. 461, 462); their secondary character and late date are shown by their purely allegoric character. Thus they are the *débris* of parables, allegorically interpreted. The matter is of some little importance, because Luke xii. 35, 36 and xiii. 25 must clearly be later than Jesus, if we assume (as Loisy rightly does) that Jesus did not teach that his return would be delayed, and perhaps did not teach his *return* at all. If then Luke xii. 35, 36 and xiii. 25 is the source of Matt. xxv. 1-13, *a fortiori* is the parable of the virgins later than Jesus, whereas Loisy is keen to keep it for him. W.'s counter-arguments seem to me more powerful and penetrating than Loisy's. Of xiii. 25 he says: 'Here the disciples simply are addressed; nothing is said of a bridegroom who rejects his bride.' Of xii. 35, 36 he says: 'Here the wedding and the lights are added; but the lord does not go to his own wedding, but returns home late in the evening from somebody else's wedding: it is he who knocks, and it is a question whether he finds admission at once; his servants are waiting for him for that purpose, and leave the light burning. Both similitudes are simple and intelligible. The impossibilities in the parable of Matthew are no evidence of its priority, and a mutual independence is inconceivable. Let the difference in form also be noted; short decisive imperatives in Luke xii., a broad parable in Matt. xxv. Which form is the primary form for the expectation of the Parousia? It was surely not originally a subject for objective, didactic and poetic presentation. The contrast in this point shows itself elsewhere also; the fermentation in Luke has in Matthew settled down and disappeared' (*Matthew*, p. 130). On the other hand, B. Weiss is an adherent for that 'independence' of the versions of Matthew and Luke, which W. regards as impossible. To him 35-38 were taken from L, and were followed in that source by 47, 48 *a* (*Quellen*, A, p. 240).

36. The wedding is nothing more than a banquet. It seems to symbolize the joys of heaven, for the Lord (*i.e.* the Messiah) returns, or comes down, from heaven. But the heavenly banquet or marriage feast seems really out of place here. The words ('to return,' or 'when he shall return, from the wedding' or 'marriage feast') could be well omitted. For the main point is not the heavenly banquet, but the earthly one which he has prepared for his servants (37). The earthly banquet symbolizes the Messianic

banquet, which itself is a symbol of the Kingdom. So W., who adds: 'A manly readiness and restrained desire is revealed in these imperatives; the expectation of the approaching Parousia creates not laxness, but energy.'

38. *Cp.* Mark xiii. 33–37. Luke seems more original than Mark in that he has three watches only—according to the Jewish reckoning. This is certainly an argument for the source of Mark having been also a source for Luke or, rather, that both knew and used the same source (*E. S.* II. pp. 445–447).

39, 40. *Cp.* Matt. xxiv. 43, 44.

41–48. THE WISE AND FOOLISH STEWARD

(*Cp.* Matt. xxiv. 45–51)

41 Then Peter said unto him, 'Lord, speakest thou this parable
42 unto us, or also to all?' And the Lord said, 'Who then is the
faithful and wise steward, whom his lord will set over his house-
43 hold, to give them their measure of food in due season? Happy
is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing.
44 Of a truth I say unto you, that he will set him over all his
45 possessions. But if that servant say in his heart, My lord de-
layeth his coming; and if he begin to beat the menservants and
46 the maidservants, and to eat and drink and to be drunken; the
lord of that servant will come on a day when he looketh not for
him, and at an hour which he doth not know, and he will cut
him in two, and will appoint his portion with the unbelievers.

47 'And that servant, who knew his lord's will, and prepared not,
or did not according to his will, shall be beaten with many
48 stripes. But he that knew not, and did what deserved stripes,
shall be beaten with few stripes. For unto whom much is given,
of him shall be much required: and to whom men have entrusted
much, of him they will ask the more.

The parable is introduced by a verse special to Luke. Peter asks whether the foregoing warnings had been meant for the disciples generally, or specially for the apostles, including himself. The answer is given in the parable, which implies that the warning is all the more necessary for them, as their position is the more responsible and important. There can be a bad steward as well as a good steward: the good steward is never slack and careless, and is sure that he, at any rate, can never be caught napping; the punishment of the bad steward is terrible.

42. The servant in Matthew becomes 'a steward' in Luke in order to indicate the moral to Peter and the apostles [*i.e.* to Christian overseers and teachers] the more clearly.

46. The bad steward is driven out to the unbelievers, *i.e.* he is excluded for ever from the Kingdom of God, which belongs to the good Christians only.

47, 48. An addition found in Luke only. See end of note on verse 35. The two verses connect badly with what has just preceded. A different offence seems referred to. W. holds that though Luke probably intends the verses merely to justify and explain the special punishment of the false Christian officer and teacher, they had originally a more general meaning. The contrast is either between Christians and non-Christians, or, more probably, between Jews and heathen. The Jews who reject Jesus are worse than the heathen who do so, for the Jews ought to know and recognize God's will. J. Weiss holds that the absolute opposition between him who knows and him who knows not is merely caused by the necessary 'gnomic antithesis'; the real point is only that the *degree* of punishment is proportioned to the *degree* of knowledge. The Christian overseers and teachers 'know' more and better; therefore their punishment must be greater. The chiefs have greater gifts than the simple believers: therefore more is asked of them, and if they fail, their fall is more serious. Some would hold that even these verses may be authentic. They may be a fragment of a separate parable and originally refer to the Jewish Scribes whose guilt and punishment are specially great. To the fragment is appended a general adage or statement. Of him to whom much is given or entrusted, much is demanded. The greater the trust or knowledge to which you are false, the greater is your sin, and the greater shall be your punishment. But the punishments are smaller here than in the verses which precede. To be beaten is a smaller punishment than to be cut in two. Are then the offences smaller too?

49–56. SIGNS OF THE END

(*Cp.* Matt. x. 34–36, xvi. 1–4)

49 'I have come to throw a fire upon the earth; and how I wish
50 it were already kindled. I have a baptism to be baptized with;
51 and how am I distressed till it be accomplished! Do ye think

that I have come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but
52 rather dissension. For from henceforth five in one house will be
53 divided, three against two, and two against three. Father will
be divided against son, and son against father; mother against
daughter, and daughter against mother; mother in law against
her daughter in law, and daughter in law against her mother
in law.'

54 And he said also to the people, 'When ye see a cloud rise in
the west, straightway ye say, Rain cometh, and so it happeneth.
55 And when the south wind bloweth, ye say, There will be heat;
56 and it cometh to pass. Hypocrites, ye know how to discern the
face of the sky [and of the earth]; how then do ye not discern
this time?

49, 50. Luke only. B. Weiss attributes the whole passage (49–53) to L.

49. Various signs of the End are brought together in these verses. It is a question whether they agree and cohere with each other. The 'fire' which Jesus wishes were already kindled is generally supposed to be the conflict and disunion of 51. W.'s views are peculiar; he says: '49–53 do not refer to the Parousia itself, but to its "pangs" or premonitory signs. 49–51 do not cohere. The fire, which Jesus desires, is a lasting and permanent effect; the baptism of death is a passing personal experience, of which he feels fear. 49 and 50 are supposed to be parallel, but they are not. Nor is 50 equivalent to 51. Nor again do 49 and 51 agree, for the desired conflagration can have nothing to do with the division of the families.' But W.'s interpretation is not by any means certain. The fire is probably the discord introduced into the world by the preaching of the Gospel (verse 51), or rather the movement stirred up, whether for or against the religion of Jesus, by the apostolic teaching, whence the discord will result. Jesus wishes that this fire was already burning, that this discord had already come, because the Kingdom, which it must precede, would then be nearer. On the other hand, his own sufferings and death must also precede the Kingdom, and at the thought of these he trembles (*E. S.* I. p. 892).

In 50 there seems to lurk a historic utterance. For would the idealizing reporter or Evangelist have said that Jesus feared the anticipated death? It seems too human a touch to have been invented. J. Weiss regards 49 and 50 as authentic and highly important. He says: 'The twin saying about fire and baptism, preserved only in Luke, is one of the most important of Jesus's utterances, because we can see from it better than from the prophecies of the Passion, which have been remodelled in accordance with the actuality, how Jesus conceived of his end. The fire of discord would not merely break out after his death, as we usually imagine, but he himself is to kindle it, and Jesus wishes that this last keen struggle were already going on, although it is to demand the sacrifice of his life. This speech gives us a glimpse into the soul of Jesus. He goes courageously to his suffering, and yet not with the obduracy and insensibility of the superhuman hero; a heavy burden oppresses his soul. Would it were all over!' Nevertheless it is doubtful whether the fire is really meant to precede the baptism. Rather the fire and the divisions are all meant to take place subsequently to Jesus's death. The verbal deviations from Matthew (Q) in 51–53 are peculiar and interesting. They are some argument for the validity of B. Weiss's view that Luke took these verses as well as 49, 50 from L (*Quellen*, A, p. 256, B, p. 132). On the other hand, it may be argued that Matthew's words 'to cast upon the earth' in x. 34 *had* to be altered in Luke's 51, because they have been already used in 49. See also note on 52.

50. Jesus's violent death must precede the completed 'Kingdom.' Loisy says that Luke has taken the metaphor of the 'baptism' from Mark x. 38, and united it artificially to the metaphor of the fire. 'The perspective of the speech is not historical. The divisions of which Jesus here speaks are not those which he saw arise, but the acute condition of things which the Evangelist knew to have been created after the death of Jesus by the preaching of his disciples' (*E. S.* I. p. 893).

52. Loisy is pretty sure that, in comparison with Matthew, Luke is secondary. He substitutes 'division' for 'sword' in 51 (I suppose in view of both 52 and 53), and noting that in the source (which Matthew reproduces) five persons were spoken of (for the same individual can be mother and mother-in-law), he speaks of a division between five persons, and ranges three against two, without noticing that other combinations are also possible. The divisions are to come 'from henceforth,' *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν*. He is far enough off from Jesus to enable him almost to confound together the particular moment at which Jesus is supposed to be speaking and his death (*E. S.* I. p. 893).

54–56. Here the verses are in place, which some MSS. have inserted into Matt. xvi. I. The unbelieving Jews know how to interpret the signs of the coming weather; they wilfully refuse to interpret aright this present season. The time which they do not know how to judge or assess rightly is the time which is shortly to culminate and end in the last Judgment, the time which demands the repentance and the belief which will soon be possible no more. They are always looking for special signs. But there is to be no special sign. The sign of the time is the time itself; or it is Jesus himself and his preaching. These are the true signs of the near Judgment and of the Messianic Kingdom.

57–59. USE THE SHORT TIME THAT AWAITS YOU AND REPENT (*Cp.* Matt. v. 25, 26)

, 58 ‘And why can ye not of yourselves judge what is right? When thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate, whilst thou art yet on the way, take pains to be freed from him; lest he drag thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and
59 the officer throw thee into prison. I tell thee, thou shalt surely not come out thence till thou hast paid the very last farthing.’

57. The verses from the Sermon on the Mount are used with a fresh introduction and a new meaning and moral. Of their own selves they could judge what is right and what they ought to do, without delay or elaborate explanation. And this they should do, while yet there is time. B. Weiss (*Quellen*, A, p. 91) thinks that 57–59 are in their right place here. Like 54–56 they come from Q. As the debtor had better arrange matters with the creditor, before things come into court, so the present era, with its signs of the nearing Judgment, urges men to be reconciled with God by penitence, so that they may not fall victims to a pitiless condemnation.

58. The construction is awkward, and there is a sort of combination by undue compression of (*a*) the analogy and (*b*) the moral to be drawn from it. What is meant is this: ‘As in an earthly quarrel it is well to be reconciled with your adversary (you being in the wrong) before you enter the court, so, as between you and God, repent before the Judgment comes.’ But the analogy passes into the moral before it is complete: hence the imperative instead of a continuation in the present tense. The parallel in the Sermon on the Mount, where the whole point is limited to earthly reconciliation and harmony, has influenced the wording here, preventing its adequate modification and expansion for the new purposes for which it is now used. But see note on 57, where it is noted that B. Weiss thinks that what we read in 58 is the original form of the warning. The question can be argued either way.

CHAPTER XIII

1-9. THE SLAUGHTERED GALILÆANS AND THE TOWER OF SILOAM—THE PARABLE OF THE BARREN FIG TREE

(Luke only)

1 At that time some came to tell him of the Galilæans, whose
2 blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices. And Jesus answered and said unto them, 'Do ye think that these Galilæans were greater sinners than all the other Galilæans, because these
3 things befell them? I tell you, Nay: but, unless ye repent, ye
4 shall all perish likewise. Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and killed them, think ye that they were more
5 guilty than all the other inhabitants of Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay: but, unless ye repent, ye shall all perish likewise.'

6 He spoke also this parable: 'A man had a fig tree planted in his vineyard; and he came and sought fruit thereon, and found
7 none. Then said he unto the dresser of his vineyard, Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree, and find none: cut it down; why should it make the very ground useless?
8 And the vinedresser answered and said unto him, Lord, let it alone this year also, till I shall have dug round it, and put manure
9 on it. Then, in the future, if it bear fruit, well; and if not, cut it down.'

1. The need of repentance, urged already in xii. 57-59, is here continued in xiii. 1-9. The story alluded to in verse 1 is not mentioned by Josephus. Neither Loisy nor Holtzmann thinks that this omission speaks against its historical character. The latter says: 'At all events quite similar horrors are recorded by Josephus of Pilate' (*Antiquities*, XVIII. 3, 2 and 4, 1). W., on the other hand, does not think that such a scandalous deed could have been passed over by Josephus in silence. He therefore supposes

that there is an error, and that the allusion is really to the murder of certain Samaritans upon Mount Garizim (Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII. 4, 1). This event led to Pilate's recall. Jesus could not have been crucified later than A.D. 35, for at Easter in 36 Pilate was no longer in office. If the murder took place after Easter 35, and this passage alludes to it, it could not have been spoken by Jesus. W.'s hypothesis seems unnecessary.

4. This accident is also not mentioned by Josephus, but as it is unpolitical, there is no reason why it should have been recorded. The point of the passage is not that the men who suffered were not guilty, but that they were not *specially* guilty. Why these men should have been chosen out as example and warning, Jesus does not say. The difficulty did not occur to him. Jesus does not criticize or deny the prevailing doctrine of the time that suffering denoted guilt.

B. Weiss holds that 1–9 are taken from L. Verse 4 shows, he thinks, that its provenance is a source written in Judæa, where such Jerusalem stories were well known, and much discussed, and where it was necessary 'gegen die volkstümliche Auffassung des Vergeltungsglaubens zu polemisieren, nach welcher jeder göttlichen Heimsuchung ein besonderes Mass menschlicher Schuld entsprechen muss' (*Quellen*, A, p. 246).

As Luke xiii. is constantly used to prove that Jesus did not believe in the current Jewish doctrine that suffering implied sin, I transcribe W.'s note in the original. 'Der Gedanke, dass aus dem Unglück nicht auf die Schuld geschlossen werden dürfe (John ix.) tritt bei Lucas nicht hervor; die Betroffenen verdienen ihr Schicksal, jedoch nicht mehr als andere, die mit ebensoviel Recht hätten betroffen werden können. Die Frage, warum denn Gott gerade an ihnen ein Exempel statuirte, wird nicht berührt. Jesu selber würde das Unterfangen einer Theodicee vermutlich vollkommen gottlos vorgekommen sein.' Loisy says much the same.

6–9. Those who are spared for a time should use the interval to good purpose, and repent. The interval will not be long. The Judgment upon a guilty people is not far off. The parable is quite in the spirit of the old prophets. It is on the same lines as Isaiah v. 1–4. There is no reason why it should not be authentic. The parable has many points of connection with the story of the barren fig tree, which Luke omits. Did the story grow up from the parable? If, in Luke's source, the parable was spoken during Jesus's stay at Jerusalem, this is all the more likely.

10–17. THE WOMAN HEALED ON THE SABBATH

(Luke only)

10 And as he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the
11 sabbath, behold, there was a woman who had a spirit of weakness
eighteen years, and she was crooked, and could not quite raise
12 herself up. And when Jesus saw her, he called her, and said
13 unto her, 'Woman, thou art released from thy weakness,' and he
laid his hands upon her. And immediately she was made straight,
14 and glorified God. But the ruler of the synagogue was indignant
that Jesus had healed on the sabbath, and said unto the people,
'There are six days in which men ought to work: in them there-
15 fore come and be healed, and not on the sabbath day.' But the
Lord answered him, and said, 'Ye hypocrites, doth not each of
you on the sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead
16 him away and water him? And ought not this woman, being a
daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen
17 years, to be loosed from this chain on the sabbath day?' And
when he had said these things, all his adversaries were ashamed:
but all the people rejoiced at all the glorious things that were
done by him.

Luke now inserts some stories and speeches not closely connected with each other. The Sabbath story of this section is peculiar to him. It probably bears the same relation to the Sabbath healing stories common to the three Synoptists as the story of the widow's son of Nain bears to the story of the daughter of Jair. Loisy supposes that it is introduced here with a symbolic meaning. As the barren fig tree represents the unconverted Israel, so the healed woman represents those humble Israelites who have listened to the Messiah's words. The miracle is supposed to have occurred on the journey to Jerusalem, but rather reflects Jesus's teaching in Capernaum (*cp.* Matt. xii. 9–14). The argument which Jesus employs is scarcely sound. The ox must be watered every day, or it would suffer greatly. Cruelty to animals was abhorrent to the Rabbis. (It is not a case of 'Selbstliebe' as Holtzmann characteristically calls it.) But the woman, who had been rheumatic for eighteen years, could well have waited another day. Unsound arguments of this kind would have been speedily detected by the trained Rabbis.

The argument, which one cannot help thinking Jesus really felt, though he did not say it, is: to heal is not to work: acts of loving pity are not labour.

11. The ascription of the woman's infirmity to demonic possession is, B. Weiss thinks, an addition of Luke to his source. Luke misunderstood what is said in 16 when Jesus describes her malady as a fetter with which Satan had bound her, and so he puts it down to possession. But Jesus cures the woman by imposition of hands, for she suffers from an ordinary natural affliction. The special source, L, has no expulsion of demons, according to B. Weiss (*Quellen*, A, p. 207).

16. *Cp.* for 'the daughter of Abraham' xix. 9 (also from L, according to B. Weiss).

18–21. Parables of Mustard and Leaven

(*Cp.* Mark iv. 30–32; Matt. xiii. 31–33)

18 So he said, 'What is the kingdom of God like? and with
19 what shall I compare it? It is like a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and put into his garden; and it grew, and became a tree; and the birds of the air lodged in its branches.
20 And again he said, 'Whereunto shall I liken the kingdom of God?
21 It is like leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened.'

Why these short parables are brought in here does not seem clear. Loisy's explanation is that as the people who rejoice in 17 represent the believing Jews, so Luke saw in the birds of 19 the converted Gentiles, and in the 'measures of meal' the whole heathen world, through which the Gospel was spreading and working when he wrote (*E. S.* II. p. 117).

22–30. The Narrow Gate

(*Cp.* Matt. vii. 13, 14, xxv. 11, 12, vii. 21–23, viii. 11, 12)

22 And he passed through the cities and villages, teaching, on
23 his journey toward Jerusalem. Then said one unto him, 'Lord,
24 are those that are saved few?' And he said unto them, 'Strive to enter through the narrow door: for many, I say unto you, will
25 seek to enter, and will not be able. When once the master of the

house hath risen up, and hath shut the door, and ye begin to
stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open
unto us; then he will answer and say unto you, I know you not
26 whence ye are. Then will ye begin to say, We ate and drank
27 in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets. But he will
say, I tell you, I know you not whence ye are; depart from me,
28 all ye workers of iniquity. There will be weeping and gnashing
of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and
all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves cast
29 forth without. And they shall come from the east, and from the
west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down
30 to table in the kingdom of God. And, behold, there are last who
shall be first, and there are first who shall be last.'

The subject of the End and the last Judgment and the Kingdom is now resumed and continued.

22. Where is Jesus supposed to be? Where are these towns and villages? In Perea? *Cp.* verse 31. Perhaps we must not press the Evangelist too closely. The verse resumes the thread of the discourse in chapter xii.; Luke likes these verses of connection. The mention of Jerusalem points forward to verse 33. For the wording *cp.* Mark vi. 6 and x. 1. For a totally different view, see Spitta, *Streitfragen*, p. 62.

23, 24. *Cp.* Matt. vii. 13, 14 (in the Sermon on the Mount). In the preceding parable it is said that the Kingdom will become very big. Here, on the other hand, a warning is uttered that though it will be big, there will nevertheless be many who will be refused admittance. The speaker does not here go so far as to say (like Matt. vii. 14), that there will only be few who will enter it. But because the Kingdom is to be big (for it includes the heathen world within its range), let none suppose that it is easy to find admission. That needs all a man's strength and struggle. Therefore: *ἀγωνίζεσθε εἰσελθεῖν.*

24. The 'narrow door' is used as a well-known metaphor.

25. The parallel to this verse in Matthew is xxv. 11, 12 in the parable of the foolish virgins. It does not seem to fit in here very well. The door which the master shuts is not quite the same door as that in 24, though it may be that the door of 24 has suggested the insertion of 25. The door of 24 is rather the gate: the door of 25 is the door of the banquet-hall or audience-chamber.

The master rises from the table to shut it. The rejected are Christians in name, but not in deed. Even personal acquaintance with Jesus gives no prerogative of admission to the Kingdom.

26, 27. *Cp.* Matt. vii. 22, 23 (in the Sermon on the Mount).

28, 29. *Cp.* Matt. viii. 11, 12.

The last half of Matt. viii. 12 comes first in Luke, to the detriment of the sense, for ἐκεῖ, 'there,' a locative, loses its point and reference.

In Matthew the meaning of the verses is that the heathen will enter the Kingdom, while the Jews will be excluded. The passage fits in less well here, where the contrast has not been between Jew and heathen, but between good Christian and bad Christian. Nevertheless Loisy thinks that in 29 and 30 the Gentiles are alluded to. Only few Jews will be saved; most go to Gehenna; the main number of the 'saved' are Gentiles (*E. S.* II. p. 122).

30. *Cp.* Mark x. 31; Matt. xix. 30, xx. 16.

31–33. DEPARTURE FROM GALILEE

(Luke only)

31 The same hour some of the Pharisees came to him, and said,
32 'Go forth and depart hence: for Herod wants to kill thee.' And
he said unto them, 'Go ye, and tell this fox, Behold, I cast out
demons and perform cures to-day and to-morrow, and on the
33 third day I am perfected. Nevertheless I must journey to-day,
and to-morrow, and the next day: for a prophet must not perish
outside Jerusalem.

31. Jesus is supposed to be on the journey to Jerusalem. The geography seems confused. In ix. 52 he leaves Galilee. Here he is still in the territory of Herod Antipas. Did Luke think that from Samaria Jesus crossed the Jordan into Perea? For Perea, though Luke (iii. 1) does not mention it, was part of Herod's territory. The next incident, as W. says, seems to indicate that Jesus is still at Capernaum. 'The Pharisees have been inserted by the redactor, as frequently. Whether we are to infer that Herod himself sent the men to Jesus in order to frighten Jesus away, and whether he is therefore called a fox seems doubtful. Jesus seems to take the warning seriously, and we may not assume that our conception of the fox was known to the ancient Jews.' Perhaps he is called a fox because he is cruel.

32, 33. These verses give rise to great difficulties. Some think that τελειοῦμαι need not mean 'I am perfected' (by death and martyrdom), but can be rendered, 'I am finished,' *i.e.* 'I shall have finished what I have to do, my work on earth.' The three days they take to mean 'a short time.' Hence Jesus says: 'What I have to do I shall do. I have still a short period of work to do here, but (πλήν) I then shall leave, and for the same short period journey from place to place, not in order to avoid Herod and his threats, but in order to fulfil my destiny, which is to die at Jerusalem.'

Can we conceive a more artificial sort of meaning, a more unnatural wording?

Yet how any good sense can be got out of the present text seems very doubtful. W. supposes interpolations: he omits in 32, 'And on the third day I am perfected,' and in 33, 'To-day and to-morrow and,' explaining thus: 'Jesus says: "I am not to be driven away by fear of Herod: I shall continue my existing life and activity for the present [*i.e.* to-day and to-morrow], nevertheless I shall shortly [*i.e.* on the following day] leave, not from fear of Herod, but because I must die in Jerusalem."' The meaning is then clear. But as the verses now stand, the words in 32, 'to-day and to-morrow I continue my work here,' contradict the words in 33, 'to-day and to-morrow and the following day I journey.' Hence the words 'to-day and to-morrow' in 33 must be interpolated. The question is only, why were they interpolated? The reason can only lie in the words of 32: 'on the third day I am perfected.' For one could not say after that: 'and on the following day I journey.' (To τελειοῦμαι W. gives its natural sense here of perfection by death.) 'In order, therefore, to make τῇ ἐχομένῃ ('on the following day') possible after τῇ τρίτῃ ('on the third day')—the two terms really mean the same thing—"to-day and to-morrow" were again repeated.' [In that way the two periods of time were made identical, instead of the second being subsequent to the first.] Thus 'and on the third day I am perfected' is the first interpolation, and it drew after it the second interpolation, 'to-day and to-morrow.'

This seems ingenious and plausible. Could the words in their corrected and shortened form have been spoken by Jesus? It all depends on whether we suppose that he went up to the capital with the fixed conviction that he must die there. My feeling is that this problem can never be settled. One can make up a more or less convincing theory either way, but the documents do not allow of assurance. It still seems to me less likely that Jesus journeyed to Jerusalem with the full conviction that he would lay down his life there. I am still disposed to agree with (*e.g.*) Pfleiderer and *his* theory rather than with (*e.g.*) J. Weiss and *his* theory. M. Loisy's view is somewhat divergent. He too thinks that the days in 32 mean only a short time, and that τελειοῦμαι refers to a near future, namely to the full accomplishment of Jesus's mission and to his entry into glory by the coming of the Kingdom. It does not follow that the healings are all to be done on one spot, and thus 32 does not in that respect necessarily contradict 33. In fact the three 'days' of activity in 32 are identical with the three days of journeying in 33. But Loisy thinks 33 has been added to locate the anecdote in the voyage, and to prepare for the menacing prophecy in 34 and 35. An argument for this is the word πλήν with which 33 opens; it often characterizes 'redactional sutures' in Luke (*E. S.* II. pp. 126, 127). Loisy translates τελειοῦμαι, 'je suis à mon terme'; I am about to arrive at my end, namely, the full accomplishment of my mission by my entry into glory and by the advent of the Kingdom. My ministry is nearly over: the *dénouement* is at hand. The 'term' alluded to in τελειοῦμαι is not *necessarily* death.

34, 35. LAMENT OVER JERUSALEM

(Matt. xxiii. 37–39)

34 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, who killest the prophets, and stonest
them that are sent unto thee; how often have I desired to gather
thy children together, as a hen gathereth her brood under her
35 wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is deserted: I say
unto you, Ye shall surely not see me until the time come when
ye shall say, Blessed in the name of the Lord is he that cometh.'

This short passage is added here by Luke rather mechanically, as it seems, because of the mention of Jerusalem in 33. But the words, if authentic, could not have been said in Galilee or on the journey, but only in Jerusalem, as in Matthew.

35. The important word ἔρημος, 'desolate,' is omitted by Luke. See the note on Matt. xxiii. 38.

It is impossible here to discuss the views of Spitta about this passage (*Streitfragen*, pp. 63–69). He holds (with the fourth Gospel) that Jesus was many times during his ministry at Jerusalem, and that 34 is only naturally to be explained upon this hypothesis. The words are authentic. 35 does not refer to the Parousia. Jesus means merely that the inhabitants of Jerusalem will see him no more till he comes up to the festival.

The words 'Blessed in the name of the Lord,' &c., simply refer to the greeting given to the pilgrims at the festivals on their arrival at Jerusalem. The passage was spoken, not as Matthew thinks at the close of the last Jerusalem ministry and just before Jesus's death, but earlier. It has nothing to do with the speech against the Pharisees. The solemn and even threatening utterance in 35 becomes on Spitta's explanation an anticlimax. 'You will not see me till I come back here for the Passover.' Moreover few critics will believe that Jesus visited Jerusalem during his ministry more than once. But what is striking and original in Spitta's explanation of the passage is his connection of it with Isaiah xvi. 1 (Septuagint and Targum). For Isaiah xvi. 1 is Messianically interpreted in the Epistle of Barnabas, by Justin and by the Targum. But in Isaiah xvi. 1, 2 we find the combination both of the word *ἔρημος* and of the bird. The Messiah is compared to a bird which protects her young, so that Merx' objection to Jesus using the metaphor (see the notes on Matt. xxiii. 37) falls to the ground. It does seem likely that the writer of the passage had his eye on, and was thinking of, Isaiah xvi. 1, 2. This does not, however, make its authenticity more likely. But it does make the explanation less likely that the speaker in 34 is rather God or the divine wisdom than Jesus the Messiah. And perhaps the 'desolateness' (*ἐρημία*) of the city might be, as Spitta thinks, not its physical desolation by ruin, but the absence of the Messiah. In that case *ἔρημος* must certainly be retained, but with another sense.

CHAPTER XIV

1–6. HEALING THE MAN WITH DROPSY

(Luke only, but *cp.* Matt. xii. 9–13 and Luke xiii. 15, 16)

1 And it came to pass, as he went into the house of one of the
rulers of the Pharisees to eat bread on the sabbath day, that they
2 watched him. And, behold, there was a man before him who had
3 the dropsy. And Jesus spoke unto the teachers of the Law and
unto the Pharisees, saying, 'Is it permitted to heal on the sabbath
4 day or not?' But they held their peace. And he laid hold of
5 the man, and healed him, and let him go. And he spoke to them,
saying, 'Which of you if his ass or his ox fall into a well, will not
6 straightway draw it out on the sabbath day?' And to these
words they could find no answer.

In Luke's version (vi. 6–11) of Matthew's story, xii. 9–13 (*cp.* Mark iii. 1–6), he had omitted Matthew's argument in 11, 12. He now uses that argument as the chief point of another similar Sabbath healing. The setting for the story is very inappropriate. Is it taken from the paragraphs which follow? Or is the story with its setting made the prelude of what is to follow? It comes to the same thing. The various Sabbath healing stories all seem to go back to one or two authentic and historical incidents which actually occurred. B. Weiss supposes that the story is taken from Luke's special source, L, but that Luke has inserted in it touches from Mark, *viz.* the Pharisees watching in 1 *b*, and 'they held their peace' in 3 *b* (*Quellen*, B, p. 123). In any case the connection of the healing with a repast is probably artificial, but it is possible that the man with the dropsy may be historical.

5. The argument is: If one may do good to an animal on the Sabbath, how much more to a man! The apparent sophistry is similar to that in xiii. 10–17. The ox would die if it remained in the well: danger to life suspends the Sabbath law. The dropsical

man was in no *immediate* danger. He could have been healed on Sunday equally well. But at bottom the argument merely means that deeds of charity and love should never be put off; they take precedence of, and temporarily invalidate, all ritual laws and the ceremonial observance of all sacred days. 'The better the day, the better the deed.' The best MS. reading 'son or ox' makes a bad collocation and an imperfect argument. Some MSS. have 'ass' (ὄνος), which I have followed in the translation. Perhaps the true original is 'sheep' (ὄϊς).

7–14. BANQUET RULES

(Luke only)

7 And noticing how they chose out the chief seats, he spoke
8 a parable to the guests, saying, 'When thou art invited by any
one to a wedding, do not sit down in the chief seat, lest some one
9 of higher rank than thou have been invited, and the host should
come and say to thee, Give this man room; and thou shouldest
10 then with shame have to take the last place. But when thou art
invited, go and sit down in the last place, that when the host
cometh, he may say unto thee, Friend, go up higher: then shalt
thou have honour in the sight of all who sit at table with thee.
11 For whoever exalteth himself shall be humbled; and he that
humbleth himself shall be exalted.'

12 Then said he also to him that had invited him, 'When thou
makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren,
neither thy kinsmen, nor thy rich neighbours; lest they too invite
13 thee in return, and thou hast thy recompence. But when thou
makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind:
14 and thou shalt be happy; for they cannot recompense thee: but
thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just.'

7. Jesus is supposed to have spoken this passage too, and the long parable about the Messianic banquet (Matthew xxii. 1–14) which follows, when dining with 'a ruler of the Pharisees' one Saturday on his journey to Jerusalem. It is clear and agreed that verse 7 is editorial, but whereas some (*e.g.* Holtzmann) think that Luke, on account of the subject-matter of 8–11, 12–14 and 15–24, has appended to his first banquet story (1–6) material which he found elsewhere, B. Weiss holds that 8–11 and 12–14 did actually in L (from which they are taken) follow on 1–6 and were spoken at the Pharisee's table, but that Luke, misunderstanding the parabolic character of these sections, took them to be, and turned them into, direct exhortations to the guests and their host. Thus of verse 7 Luke added to his source all except the words ἔλεγεν δὲ παραβολήν, 'he spoke a parable.'

This seems a not improbable argumentation. In that case both 8–11 and 12–14 are real parables. The first section (8–11) would be intended to lead up to and illustrate the adage in 11. As if one should say: 'Just as at a banquet you ought to act in such and such a way, for if you act so, you will fare well, and if you act otherwise, you will fare ill, so generally be humble, for if you are humble, you will be exalted (in the Kingdom), and if you are proud, you will be abased (*i.e.* you will be rejected from the Kingdom).'

Another view about 8–10 is that Jesus gave in these verses a real rule for proper behaviour at a banquet. In that case it is Luke who made a parable out of them, and added the moral in verse 11. He turned a rule of mundane behaviour into a parabolic illustration of a moral and religious maxim.

The view that 8–10 is a parable is the general one, held by both B. Weiss and Holtzmann; the second view is Loisy's and also W.'s, who adds that Jesus must often have given expression to rules or maxims dealing with mundane affairs, but that this is the only example of such rules in the Gospels. It is, however, perhaps hardly fair to call the passage 'mundane,' for it teaches the worth and duty of humility, just as the next passage speaks of charity.

9. 'The displaced guest goes from top to bottom because the intermediate places have been filled' (Plummer).

10. For the whole passage, *cp.* Proverbs xxv. 6, 7. J. Weiss points out that the advice given is all too practical. It looks like a means of obtaining advancement by humility. He thinks that the historic Jesus is not speaking here, but a certain section of the community, who could not do enough in renunciation and self-abasement.

11. The proverb seems to lift the subject on to a higher plane. Luke, at all events, is thinking of the heavenly banquet and of that final Judgment where the proud shall indeed be humbled. *Cp.* xviii. 14.

12–14. This section seems also to contain a sort of parable, for, as B. Weiss says, its intention appears to be to illustrate from a concrete case the general principle that true kindness or true goodness looks for no return. The only recompense which does not interfere with the purity of love is a recompense beyond the grave. Loisy holds that this interpretation is doubtful. Rather the original sense was meant quite literally. But Luke understood it allegorically, and probably has altered the language. He has in view the conditions of Christian propaganda among the Gentiles; he is thinking of the poor and infirm in the spiritual order (*E. S.* II. p. 134).

15–24. The Messianic Banquet

(*Cp.* Matt. xxii. 1–10)

15 And hearing these words, one of those that sat at table with
him said unto him, 'Happy is he that shall eat bread in the
kingdom of God.'
16 Then said he unto him, 'A man prepared a great banquet, and
17 invited many guests. And at the hour of the banquet he sent his
servant to say to them that were invited, Come; for all is now
18 ready. And they all with one accord began to excuse themselves.
The first said unto him, I have bought a piece of land, and I must
19 go and see it: I pray thee hold me excused. And another said,
I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I am going to test them: I
20 pray thee hold me excused. And another said, I have married a
21 wife, and therefore I cannot come. So that servant came, and
reported these words to his lord. Then the master of the house
was angry, and said to his servant, Go out quickly into the streets
and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor, and the maimed,
22 and the blind, and the lame. And the servant said, Lord, what
thou hast commanded hath been done, and there is still room.
23 And the lord said unto the servant, Go out into the highways and
hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled.
24 For I say unto you that none of those men who were invited shall
taste of my banquet.'

15. The interjection of the guest is intended to make and mark the transition from the earthly to the heavenly banquet. Luke drew the parable of the Messianic banquet from another connection, if not from another source, and he joins it on to its present place by means of this editorial link. Whether Matthew's and Luke's versions of the parable are drawn from a single source (Q), or whether, as B. Weiss holds, Luke's version is taken from L,

may be left here undecided. God is the heavenly counterpart of the ideal host in 13, who asks, not the rich and the favoured, but the poor and the outcast, to his banquet.

16. For Matthew's king, in this parable, Luke has 'a man.' In Matthew, Jesus is the son for whose sake the king makes the feast. In Luke, Jesus is the servant who summons the guests, whereas in Matthew it is the servants who do this, *i.e.* the apostles.

21. Luke tells more definitely who the new guests are to be. He has, as some think, made the more general (and more original) words (found in Matt.) more specific (*cp.* xiv. 13). The poor and the outcast have received Jesus's teaching: the 'upper classes' among the Jews have rejected it.

22, 23. An addition of Luke's. These additional persons—outcasts of field and highway—are the heathen. On the other hand B. Weiss thinks that both 22 and 23 stood in L. Luke's addition is not these two verses, but 24, which really contradicts 21. For *all* Israel is not rejected, only the Pharisees and the Scribes and such like; the poor and the outcast of 21 are Israelites. But 24 does not imply, as Weiss seems to think, that all Israel has been rejected. Logically, it is true, the invitation should have been extended to all Israel, but from the point of view of the parable, it is limited in the first instance to the classes who refused it.

The imperative *ἀνάγκασον* means literally 'constrain,' or even 'compel,' and thus translated and understood the verse has had terrible consequences indeed. But Holtzmann points out that the verb need not here mean more than 'urge,' 'summon,' 'bid,' as in Mark vi. 45.

The house is to become full. Here again the idea is of the width and universality of the new Kingdom. It is when the difficulty of any individual entering it by his own moral exertions is alluded to that we hear of the many who will be called and of the few who will be chosen and will enter. But nevertheless all are to try to enter it. It is not merely a matter of grace or election. The element of human effort, power and freedom also comes in.

24. Luke forgets that there is only one servant to whom the King (=God) is speaking. He also forgets that these rejected people had excluded themselves. The parable is constantly falling into allegory, both in Matthew and in Luke.

25-35. TRUE DISCIPLESHIP AND ITS CONDITIONS: ITS COST SHOULD BE COUNTED BEFOREHAND!

(*Cp.* Matt. x. 37, 38)

25 And great crowds journeyed with him: and he turned, and
26 said unto them, 'If any man come to me, and hate not his father,
and mother, and wife, and children, and brothers, and sisters, yea,
27 and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. And whoever
doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple.

28 'For which of you, intending to build a tower, sitteth not down
first, and reckoneth the cost, whether he have sufficient to finish
29 it? Lest haply, having laid the foundation, and not being able to
30 finish it, all that behold it begin to mock him, saying, This man
31 began to build, and was not able to finish. Or what king, setting
forth to make war against another king, sitteth not down first,
and deliberateth whether he be able with ten thousand to meet
32 him that cometh against him with twenty thousand? And if not,
while the other is yet far off, he sendeth an embassy, and asketh
33 for conditions of peace. So then everyone of you that renounceth
not all his possessions, he cannot be my disciple.

34 'Salt, then, is good: but if the salt have lost its savour, where-
35 with shall it be seasoned? It is neither fit for the land, nor for
the dunghill; men throw it away. Who hath ears to hear, let
him hear.'

The corrective or 'other side' to the conception and picture of the banquet with its many guests is here given. Though the invitation to the banquet is freely made to all, and though many partake of it, yet the number of true disciples can be but small. Are we to understand by this that within the future Kingdom there will be differences of worth? To enter it, it is not necessary to be a disciple in the fullest sense; for the complete discipleship involves martyrdom; yet one can enter the Kingdom without so absolute a test. But undoubtedly the idea of the extent of the Kingdom varies. As a contrast and warning to the proud unbelieving Pharisees, it is pointed out that, though the Kingdom will be wide enough to include the poor, the outcast and the heathen, it will exclude *them*. But on other occasions, and from other points of view, the Kingdom seems to contract as if it was only intended for the full and true disciples of the Christ.

25. According to B. Weiss, to whom the whole section from 25 to 33 comes from L, this introductory verse is no editorial link or creation, but taken verbally from the source. So too in Mark viii. 34 the parallel verses are spoken to the 'crowd.' Loisy, on the other hand, regards 25 as purely editorial. 'Le discours traitant des conditions requises pour être disciple, pour "suivre" Jésus et "marcher derrière lui," l'évangéliste suppose qu'une foule de gens marchaient derrière Jésus sur un chemin' (*E. S.* I. p. 894). Many may pretend to be his followers and may applaud his teaching, but they will not have the strength to become and remain true disciples. The setting for these famous sentences, whether historic or no, is very striking. Jesus, instead of encouraging the crowd who collect round him, proceeds to disappoint them. They expect, perchance, that he will lead them to triumph and victory. He, on the contrary, declares that his true followers and disciples must be prepared for renunciation and sacrifice and death. He knows his destined doom, and those who would keep near him must be ready for similar trials and a similar fate. He would wish at once to separate the true disciples from the false.

26. *Cp.* Matt. x. 37. For 'hate,' *cp.* Matt. vi. 24. Absolute hate is, perhaps, not intended. W. renders *μισεῖ* here by 'hintansetzt.' What is meant is that family and even life itself must take a second place. Full discipleship means complete renunciation. Compare the saying about Levi in Deut. xxxiii. 9: 'He saith to his father and to his mother, I have not seen them; neither doth he acknowledge his brethren or know his own children.' Or, with Merx we may assume that 'hate' is a 'late' change and exaggeration, betraying 'kirchlich disciplinären Einfluss.' On the other hand, Pfleiderer thinks that 'hate' was fully meant and is original. Matthew deliberately weakens and compromises. Jesus was not the gentle apostle of peace, but the man of heroic resolves—the reformer, full of storm and stress, who determined to fight the existing powers of the world (xii. 49 *seq.*), and, confident of victory (xii. 32), demands from his disciples that complete breach with all social and family ties which he had himself achieved (Luke ix. 58 *seq.*; Mark iii. 31). Pfleiderer, *Urchristentum*, I. p. 445. J. Weiss strongly advocates the same view. Jesus often uses the very strongest possible expressions. *Cp.* Matt. viii. 22, v. 29, vi. 24. So too Loisy, *E. S.* I. p. 894. It may, however, be questioned whether we must not, in that case, press the words 'cannot be my disciple.' It does not follow that an absolute surrender is necessary for the attainment of the Kingdom. Full discipleship is one thing; entry into the Kingdom

another. Loisy, on the other hand, thinks that no distinction of this kind is allowable or intended. 'Il n'est dit aucunement que l'on puisse avoir, sans le "suivre," une part assurée dans le royaume. Si Jésus insiste sur la nécessité de l'abnégation volontaire, au lieu de s'en tenir au point de vue des béatitudes, et s'il se met lui-même en avant, au lieu de parler seulement du royaume, c'est que les circonstances ont changé, que la préparation du royaume paraît maintenant plus laborieuse, et que le Sauveur, pour effectuer le groupement des enfants du royaume, a besoin d'affirmer sa mission de chef du ralliement.' It would certainly seem as if Matthew had softened rather than Luke hardened the wording. B. Weiss uses this and other differences in the passage to prove that the whole comes from L. 'Dass Lukas das milde und in der Sache doch völlig ausreichende Wort Matt. x. 37 in die ungeheure Schroffheit des Wortes xiv. 26 umgebildet haben sollte, die doch ihre Berechtigung nur für den ganz speziellen Fall hat, dass die nächsten Verwandten einen von Jesu abziehen wollen, ist einfach undenkbar, und für die Vermehrung der letzteren durch Weib und Geschwister lässt sich wirklich kein schriftstellerisches Motiv absehen' (*Quellen*, A., p. 255).

The words ἔτι τε καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ ('and also his own soul') are a parallel to part of Matt. x. 39 which verse is reproduced more fully by Luke in xvii. 33.

It is noteworthy that the words 'cannot be my disciple' which are the equivalent of Matthew's 'is not worthy of me' occur again in verse 33. This is an argument, which B. Weiss is not slow to use, that the source of 28–33 is also the source of 25–27. That source to Loisy is Q; to B. Weiss it is L.

27. *Cp.* Matt. x. 38. The verse is wanting in the S.S. and may be a later insertion.

28–33. Luke only.

It is better not to attempt that which is beyond your power to complete. Better never to begin to be a full disciple than to put down the cross after once you have taken it up.

Such is the meaning of the two parables, which do not, however, quite suit the moral in 33: '*Thus*, whoever cannot and does not renounce all his possessions cannot be my disciple.' It has therefore been supposed by Jülicher that originally the parables rather urged than dissuaded. 'Who that has begun to build would not sell all he has rather than leave it unfinished? What king who would defend his independence would not rather risk his all so as to defeat the foe?' But W. points out that it is risky and doubtful to use the moral to correct the parable: usually the reverse procedure is more probable. And Luke would hardly have made Jesus say this passage to the multitude, if his words contained, not a caution against discipleship, but a summons to seek it. In fact 33 is, as Loisy says, an editorial link which is intended to fit the parables into the injunction of renouncement. For 28-32 do not really quite justify 26 and 27. Those two verses ask for complete renunciation. These urge that no one should enter upon a life of sacrifice unless prepared to carry it out to the end. Nevertheless Loisy holds that one would be wrong to deduce from this difference that there are two classes of disciples, and that absolute renouncement is not required from all who wish to enter the Kingdom, and that there are other ways of being saved than that of complete renunciation. I cannot help feeling that this is doubtful. Would Jesus have really thought that an ordinary pious householder would not enter the Kingdom at the Resurrection of the dead, even though he was not able to become a disciple, renouncing all?

34, 35. Matt. v. 13 (in the Sermon on the Mount).

The disciples are the salt. If they are in the fullest sense disciples—men who have renounced and will renounce all—they are the salt of the earth; if not, they are valueless.

There is a certain danger in double grades of morality or religion. Nevertheless, the facts of life show that there is always an inner ring, a small first class. A big second class may enter the Kingdom; the fully religious, they who give up all for God and the Highest, can only, and always will, be few. The huge demand made in 33 has had great effects upon the world. Some it may have depressed. Those who could not be complete disciples of the heavenly may have become all the more disciples of the earthly. But to a few in every generation the demand has drawn out all the goodness and greatness that was in them, and put in still more.

Mr Westermarck has some interesting observations which bear upon this subject. 'We must not,' he says, 'confound the moral law with the moral ideal. Duty is the minimum of morality, the supreme moral ideal of the best man is the maximum of it. Those who sum up the whole of morality in the word "ought," identify the minimum and the maximum, but I fail to see that morality is better for this. Rather it is worse. The recognition of a "super-obligatory" does not lower the moral ideal; on the contrary it raises it, or, at any rate, makes it more possible to vindicate the moral law and to administer it justly. It is nowadays a recognized principle in legislation that a law loses part of its weight if it cannot be strictly enforced. If the realization of the highest moral ideal is commanded by a moral law, such a law will always remain a dead letter, and morality will gain nothing. Far above the anxious effort to fulfil the commandments of duty stands the free and lofty aspiration to live up to an ideal, which, unattainable as it may be, threatens neither with blame nor remorse him who fails to reach its summits. Does not experience show that those whose thoughts are constantly occupied with the prescriptions of duty are apt to become hard and intolerant?' (*Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, I. p. 153). One may not entirely agree with the writer, and his remarks may need qualification, but they seem to me to be eminently suggestive, and to constitute a fair, if unconscious defence of the double morality, the duty for all and the ideal for a few, to which the words of Jesus have given rise.

CHAPTER XV

1–10. GOD'S LOVE OF THE REPENTANT SINNER—THE PARABLES OF THE LOST SHEEP AND THE LOST COIN

(*Cp.* Matt. xviii. 12–14)

1 And all the tax-collectors and sinners came near to him to
2 hear him. And the Pharisees and scribes murmured, saying,
3 'This man receives sinners, and eats with them.' And he spoke
4 this parable unto them, saying, 'What man of you, having an
hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety
and nine in the pasture, and go after the one which is lost, until
5 he find it? And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his
6 shoulders, rejoicing. And when he hath come home, he calleth
together his friends and neighbours, saying unto them, Rejoice
7 with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost. I say unto
you, that in the same way there will be greater joy in heaven over
one sinner that repenteth, than over ninety and nine just persons,
who have no need of repentance.

8 'Or what woman having ten pieces of silver, if she lose one
piece, doth not light a candle, and sweep the house, and search
9 carefully until she find it? And when she hath found it, she
calleth her friends and her neighbours together, saying, Rejoice
10 with me; for I have found the piece which I lost. In like manner,
I say unto you, is there joy in the presence of the angels of God
over one sinner that repenteth.'

The introductory verses for the parables are taken and made up from Mark ii. 15, 16 (Luke v. 29, 30). The Evangelist arranges a situation to provide a background for the great parables which are to follow. We must not enquire how all the tax-collectors and sinners and Scribes and Pharisees appear together upon the scene. B. Weiss, however, holds that verses 1 and 2 are taken direct from L. He also thinks that the prodigal son parable is the real reply to 2, and that 3–10 have been inserted from another source. The two parables in 3–10 are from Q, the prodigal son from L. The first two parables describe 'die suchende Sünderliebe Gottes.' Only the third parable really refers to the introduction, 'sofern das Murren des älteren Bruders über die Aufnahme des sündigen Bruders so treffend zurückgewiesen wird' (*Quellen*, A, pp. 246, 247). In the parable of the prodigal son the father makes no efforts to reclaim the son, whereas it is the *efforts* made to find the lost which is the point of the two parables from Q (4–10). These efforts not only represent the 'suchende Sünderliebe' of God, but also introduce and suggest the conclusion in Matthew that we too ought to do all in our power, even as God does, to reclaim and regain the erring and sinning brother. Thus to L the point of the parable of the prodigal son in the connection in which he has placed it is in its second part—an argument which speaks for the authenticity and originality of that part. Luke inserted the two short parables from Q in this place because just as the father rejoices over the returned prodigal, so do the shepherd and the woman rejoice over the discovery of the lost sheep and money. B. Weiss also regards 6 and 7, and probably 10 (*Quellen*, B, p. 61), as additions or modifications of Luke. It is doubtful whether these ingenious arguments are accurate or necessary. For all these parables alike illustrate the interest which God (including therefore, in God's service, Jesus) takes in the sinner, and His constant desire that he should 'return' and be 'found.' Repentance, in this chapter, is looked at from a point of view somewhat different from that of the previous chapter. The theme is not, 'Repent while there is yet time,' but how good repentance is and how beloved of God. It is looked at, as W. says, 'von der freundlichen, nicht von der herben Seite.' The doctrine is in full accordance with Ezekiel and the Rabbis, and is expressed with exquisite beauty, tenderness and simplicity. Moreover, the moral which it draws for our own human action is novel and original. Because God is keen that the sinner should repent, and rejoices when he does so, therefore Jesus's action was justified. Because God loves the repentant, therefore we are to love the sinner, *i.e.* we are to seek his conversion by active goodness, helpful solicitude, and redeeming love. Jesus teaches a full individualism. In God's eyes every human soul has value, and God desires that none should be 'lost.' And yet the same Jesus could say, 'Few enter the gate,' and apparently predict the fate of the hostile Pharisees with complacency and satisfaction. The truth is that the heat of conflict, the intense conviction that he was in the right and his opponents in the wrong, made him unable to apply his own splendid teaching all round. The soul of the 'bad Pharisee' must be as dear to God as the soul of the 'outcast' and the 'sinner.' God must want to save one as much as the other.

1. This verse sums up one of the specific characteristics of Jesus and one of the new excellences of the gospel. 'The sinners drew near to hear him.' Surely this is a new note, something which we have not yet heard in the Old Testament or of *its* heroes, something which we do not hear in the Talmud or of *its* heroes. 'The sinners drew near to hear him': his teaching did not repel them. It did not palter with, or make light of sin, but it gave comfort to the sinner. The virtues of repentance are gloriously praised in the Rabbinical literature, but this direct search for, and appeal to, the sinner, are new and moving notes of high import and significance. The good shepherd who searches for the lost sheep, and reclaims it and rejoices over it, is a new figure, which has never ceased to play its great part in the moral and religious development of the world. Yet one can also see in the greater joy over the repentant sinner than over the righteous who does not need to repent, over the returned prodigal than over his less interesting, but more virtuous brother, a note which might lead, and occasionally has led, to certain erroneous conclusions. For man, in his imperfection and inadequate unity, 'justice' must sometimes supply the corrective to 'love.' In God alone is the unity complete.

2. 'The Pharisees murmured.' B. Weiss, as I have already mentioned, thinks that the parable of the prodigal son was spoken in direct answer to this murmuring. The elder son murmured at the reception of his younger brother, and the rebuke which the father administered to him is the rebuke which Jesus desires to administer to the Pharisees. It is doubtful whether this argument is correct. At any rate the sinners are not definitely described as repentant, which they would, I imagine, have been, if the introduction and the second part of the parable of the prodigal son had been intended to be in special and close relation to one another.

3. 'This parable.' Three parables, however, follow. The explanation given by B. Weiss is that this verse too, as well as 1 and 2, is from the special source (L), and was followed by the parable of the prodigal son. This seems doubtful. See *E. S.* II. p. 138, n. 3. 'This parable' must rather refer to the 'parabolic discourse' as a whole. If the introduction had been composed by L for the third parable only, the word 'parable' would have been

probably altered by Luke into the plural when he inserted the two other parables.

4–7. *Cp.* Matt. xviii. 12–14.

7. 'Ninety and nine just.' M. Loisy is very fair and also quite accurate when he says: 'The righteous who are spoken of are the true servants of God; it is no part of the object of the parable to enquire who they are; but, all theological considerations apart, it cannot be maintained that these righteous have a purely hypothetical existence, or that Jesus would not have spoken of the truly righteous, and would have mocked at the righteous according to the Law, because the latter, without suspecting it, are in need of conversion. The righteous must be as real as the sinners. When Jesus uttered this parable, he did not propose to formulate a theory of salvation, nor to suggest that adherence to himself personally was an absolute condition of righteousness; he supposes that many of his hearers, strict and rigidly moral Jews, may stand well with God; what he asserts is that sinners converted by his ministry procure for heaven a joy like that of the shepherd who finds his lost sheep' (*E. S.* II. p. 140).

In some points Matthew, in others Luke, will have preserved the text of the original parable more accurately. I will not discuss the details here on which the authorities (as usual) are divided. It is only this verse, moreover, where the question is of interest. Is Matt. xviii. 13 more original than Luke xv. 7 or *vice versa*? B. Weiss holds that the originality is on the side of Matt. xviii. 13. The description there is 'menschlich schön und wahr.' Luke has already inserted 6 (which is merely an anticipation of 9), and therefore he transposes the thought of Matt. xviii. 13 from the parable into the moral. But its transference to God's joy over the repentant sinner (which is to prepare for the joy of the father over the returned prodigal) has something unsuitable (*unschickliches*) (*Quellen*, A, p. 248). I suppose Weiss means that this joy is justifiable in man, but is not justifiable in God. Loisy, on the other hand, thinks that Luke is more original than Matthew. Only Luke's present text is slightly modified from the original, which probably ran: 'there is more joy before God (*i.e.* God feels more joy) when a single sinner repents, &c.' Both 7 and 10 go back probably to a single original, 'before God' (*i.e.* to God), or 'before heaven' (*E. S.* II. p. 142, n. 1).

Nor does Loisy agree with Weiss in thinking that verse 6 is an insertion of Luke's. And I think that Loisy is right. The verse supplies a natural and suitable feature in the parable. And I also agree with Loisy in thinking that there is really no evidence in Matthew that the direct moral of the parable is that we are to do all we can, even as God does, to reclaim the erring brother. In truth (*cp.* the notes on Matthew) the connection of the parable in Matthew is less good than that in Luke. The lost sheep have nothing originally to do with the 'little ones' of whom Matthew is speaking. And perhaps Loisy is also right in thinking that the paradox of Luke xv. 7 disconcerted Matthew and that he intentionally omitted it. See below on verse 10.

8. Both this parable and the preceding one are taken, according to Loisy and B. Weiss, from Q. To Loisy the parable of the prodigal son is also taken from Q. More probably it was taken from some other source—B. Weiss's L or another.

8–10. Luke only. One of the homeliest, quaintest, and most telling parables in the Gospels.

10. It is probable, as Loisy holds, that the parable was read by Matthew in Q, but omitted by him intentionally. Nevertheless the 'angels' of Luke xv. 10 suggested to him his verse in xviii. 10. But that Matthew also read the parable of the prodigal son in Q and intentionally omitted it, seems to me much more doubtful (*E. S.* II. pp. 138, 245).

The angels are God's court. Some think they are named here to avoid 'anthropopathic' expressions about God Himself. The original idea probably was that God Himself was more pleased and had more joy. In verse 7 this is more gently expressed by the phrase 'joy in heaven.' In 10 the angels are substituted for God.

The parable of the lost sheep is altered by Matthew. Luke has it in its older form, and with its original simple meaning. It may be that Matthew knew the parable of the lost coin and omitted it purposely. For the angels of Luke xv. 10 may have suggested to Matthew his use of angels in xviii. 10. Loisy supposes that Matthew disliked the paradox of the parable that God cared more for the repentant than for the righteous (though such a paradox—Loisy probably is quite unaware of this—is extremely familiar to Jewish ears). Loisy says: 'It is this paradox which must have puzzled the editor of the first Gospel, as it has puzzled many others: Matthew did not desire that God should appear more appreciative of the return of the guilty than of the service of good men; besides, he did not wish to allow people who did not believe in Jesus to be considered righteous; lastly, as he interpreted the parable as an allegory, and as he saw in the Christ the keeper of the sheep, he had no place for the assembly of friends and neighbours who share the joy of the shepherd. He knew the parable in its integrity; not judging it suitable to reproduce it as it was, and thinking that he could make something out of it for his lesson against causing the little ones to offend, he cut out all that did not fit the application which he wished to make of it' (*E. S.* II. p. 144).

11–32. The Prodigal Son

(Luke only)

11, 12 And he said, 'A man had two sons: and the younger of them
said to his father, Father, give me the portion of the property that
13 falls to me. And he divided unto them his possessions. And not
many days after, the younger son collected together all that he
had, and journeyed into a far country, and there wasted his property
14 in riotous living. And when he had spent all, there arose a severe
15 famine in that land; and he began to be in want. And he went
and joined himself to a citizen of that country; and he sent him
16 into his fields to feed the swine. And he would fain have filled
his belly with the pods that the swine did eat: but no one gave
17 him any. Then when he came to himself he said, How many
hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and
18 I perish here with hunger! I will arise and go to my father, and
will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before
19 thee, and am no longer worthy to be called thy son: make me as
20 one of thy hired servants. And he arose, and came to his father.
But while he was yet a long way off, his father saw him, and was
moved with pity, and he ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him.
21 And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven
and in thy sight, and am no longer worthy to be called thy son.
22 But the father said to his servants, Bring out quickly the best
robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on
23 his feet: and bring the fatted calf, and kill it; and let us eat, and
24 be merry: for this my son was dead, and has come to life again;
he was lost, and has been found.

25 'And they began to be merry. Now his elder son was in the
field: and as he came and drew nigh to the house, he heard musick
26 and dancing. And he called one of the servants, and asked what
27 these things meant. And he said unto him, Thy brother has
come; and thy father has killed the fatted calf, because he has

28 received him back safe and sound. And he was angry, and would
not go in: so his father came out, and sought to appease him.
29 And he answered and said to his father, Lo, these many years do
I serve thee, and I have never transgressed a commandment of
thine; and yet to me thou hast never given even a kid, that I
30 might make merry with my friends. But when this son of thine
has come, who has devoured thy property with harlots, thou hast
31 killed for him the fatted calf. And he said unto him, Son, thou
32 art always with me, and all that I have is thine. It was right
that we should make merry and rejoice: for this thy brother
was dead, and hath come to life again; he was lost, and has been
found.'

It is dubious whether this parable was known to Matthew. M. Loisy says indeed, 'There is nothing to show that it was not, and that Matthew did not omit it with intention,' but this seems hazardous. The hypothesis has an interest, namely, to try to argue that the parable was in Q and is therefore old.

12. Merx thinks there is evidence that the oldest text ran: 'And he allocated, or apportioned, unto him his (proper) property.' The father does not divide his entire property among his sons. The younger son receives his share; the rest remains as the property of the father. Otherwise neither 29 or 31 is intelligible. Loisy thinks that the existing text does not imply otherwise. W. differs: see below.

16. *κεράτια*. The fruit or pods of the carob tree. They are hard and indigestible, says Holtzmann, and only the very poor will eat them: like acorns with us, they are usually given to the pigs. That somehow the very carob pods are withheld from him, 'manque,' as Loisy says, 'de vraisemblance.'

17. 'He came to himself,' *i.e.* in a moral sense he repented. But M. Loisy says it means only that he regained his reason. *Cp.* Acts xii. 11.

18. 'Heaven' in this sense as direct synonym for 'God' only here in the Gospels (W.).

21. He does not add, 'make me your hireling' (19); he is too ashamed to do more than just confess his sin.

22. 'Hand without ring is as servile as feet without shoes' (W.).

24. 'He was dead,' *i.e.* to his father. But there is also the hidden meaning, 'he was dead through sin.'

The parable consists of two parts, of which the first is easy and straightforward, the second (24–32) less so. The first part points out that whenever the sinner repents, God receives him gladly. Nothing, by the way, can be more Jewish and Rabbinic than this. The praises of repentance are sung by the Rabbis in a thousand tones.

The second part (I condense some of W.'s remarks) deals with the elder brother of the prodigal. In the first part he had been only incidentally mentioned, just to explain how it was that the younger son could be spared from the farm. Otherwise he does not come in; perhaps he took part in the general rejoicing: he had no cause to feel himself injured, for he had already received his share of the property (12). The second part, which is later in date than the first, attempts, not very successfully, to answer the theological or ethical problem which it detects in the first part.

The first part closes with the moral in 24*a*, and 24*b* forms the connecting link between it and the second part.

The same moral forms the conclusion of the second part, though the tone is different. For before the tone was joyous; here it is exculpatory: 'no other course was open or possible to me.' In the first part both sons receive their share of the property which is divided between them; in the second part the older son is his father's servant, who may not even kill a kid unbidden. He has merely the promise of succession (31).

The second part uses the older brother for a particular purpose. It makes him express his indignation at his father's conduct in order to suggest and to answer the question: did the penitent prodigal deserve a better treatment than he who had not sinned? The answer is given in 31, 32. W. thinks that the answer is unsatisfying. No reply is really made to the complaint in 29; no reference is made to the fact that the prodigal is received again into the farm. I am not sure that W. is right. For in the application of the parable we have to remember that there is not only a certain limited quantity of 'heavenly beatitude' to be divided up. Though the repentant receives of it, the 'righteous who have not sinned' can receive of it no less. This disposes of the difficulty that the prodigal is received back into the farm. As to the complaint in 29, it is equivalent to the Rabbinic parallel: 'Some receive the Kingdom in an hour [*e.g.* by a death-bed repentance]; some hardly enter it after a lifetime's struggle.' The higher divine equity is beyond tit for tat. It is noticeable that it is no Jewish commentator but J. Weiss, the eager, though liberal, Lutheran theologian, who makes the following cogent remarks.

Let me add that the gospel which he says the parable proclaims is the purest Judaism. 'It is always to be noted afresh, that the gospel of the grace of God is announced without any reference to the cross or the redemptive work of Christ. There is no hint that the love of God must first set free, so to speak, or that a redeemer was needed. Jesus trusts in his heavenly Father that without more ado He will give His love to every sinner who comes to God in penitence and humble confidence. Thus our parable is in fact a "gospel" in miniature, but not a gospel of Christ or of the cross, but the glad tidings of the love of the heavenly Father for His children.'

M. Loisy thinks that though the parable has two parts, it may, perhaps, nevertheless form a unity. He points out that if the elder brother had no part to play he need not have been mentioned at all. One son would have sufficed. 'The arrangement of the narrative appears based on the different conduct of the two sons, and on the attitude of the father and the elder son towards the younger; the object is not merely to show the goodness of God towards sinners, but to make it clear that those who have not fallen would be wrong in blaming that goodness. God is the father of all men; He receives the penitent sinner as a lost son, who comes back to his father's house; his other children, who have remained faithful, ought not to complain of an indulgence which brings no harm to them, but rather rejoice because their brothers who had gone astray have returned to the right path, and that the family is complete. Thus the goodness of God would be explained by the first part of the parable, and defended by means of the second. The narrative would appear to possess a sufficient unity and to be dominated by a single idea, as it is of the same complexion from one end to the other' (*E. S.* II. p. 153). The second part of the parable specially justifies Jesus's eating and associating with 'publicans and sinners'—at least so far as they have repented of their sins. They should be feasted and fêted more than those who have never left the strait path of righteousness.

Pfleiderer rightly notices that Luke, having special sympathy for the poor, gave special prominence to those features in Jesus's character and teaching which were for this reason peculiarly sympathetic to him. In him Jesus is not, as in Mark, the heroic and tempestuous reformer, but the merciful Saviour of the sinners and the afflicted. And this, too, was without doubt *one* feature or side of the *historic* Jesus. Doubtless, too, Jesus *had* a predilection for the poor as against the rich. A certain religious socialism was characteristic of him (*Urchristentum*, I. pp. 543, 544).

CHAPTER XVI

1-9. The Parable of the Unjust Steward

(Luke only)

1 And he said also unto his disciples, 'There was a rich man,
who had a steward; and this steward was accused to him of
2 wasting his property. And he called him, and said unto him,
What is this that I hear of thee? give an account of thy steward-
3 ship; for thou canst not be steward any longer. Then the steward
said within himself, What shall I do now that my lord taketh
away from me the stewardship? I cannot dig; to beg I am
4 ashamed. I know what I will do, that, when I am removed from
5 the stewardship, they may receive me into their houses. So he
called every one of his lord's debtors unto him, and said unto the
6 first, How much owest thou unto my lord? And he said, An
hundred measures of oil. And he said unto him, Here, take thy
7 bond, and sit down quickly, and write fifty. Then said he to
another, And how much owest thou? And he said, An hundred
measures of wheat. And he said unto him, Here, take thy bond,
8 and write eighty. And the lord commended the unjust steward,
because he had acted prudently; for the children of this world are
more prudent towards their own generation than are the children
9 of the light. And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of
the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when it fails, they may
receive you into the everlasting tents.

The parable has often presented difficulties to commentators. It is, however, probable that, though it is clumsily constructed and not particularly edifying, its intended meaning is simple enough. B. Weiss confidently, and Loisy hesitatingly, ascribe it to Q.

4. The subjects of 'they may receive' are probably the debtors of 5.

6. The debtors are probably tenants or metayers who pay a certain proportion of the produce to their landlord. The 'bond' which tells the amount is to be secretly re-written by the tenant and a smaller sum inscribed.

8. 'The lord commended': some think that Luke here means the 'lord' or landlord of the parable. But how can he *praise* the steward? Here the awkward assumptions begin. For one has to assume that the lord, who had somehow found out the deceit of his steward, did not morally approve his conduct, did not any the less dismiss him from his stewardship, and even perhaps punished him all the more. He only 'praised' him in so far as he thought that his trick was very clever.

The second part of the verse, beginning with 'for the children,' may be the added reflection of Luke, though he places it in the mouth of the 'lord.' In the quality of cleverness the children of this age are superior to the children of light—at any rate in their dealings with their own kind. They are at pains to make a better use of money for their mundane ends than the others do for their heavenly ends. 'The children of this world' is a phrase which seems to have a Pauline ring about it. The 'children of light' occurs in 1 Thess. v. 5; Eph. v. 8; John xii. 36. The technical and dualistic opposition resembles John and seems out of place on the lips of the Jesus of the Synoptics.

On the other hand, W. and J. Weiss maintain that the 'lord' (κύριος) in verse 8 is certainly Jesus. This is dubious. Luke xviii. 6 is not quite an adequate parallel. As we have the text now, the master or lord is most probably the rich man of the parable itself. But may not Luke have wrongly edited his material? This is possible and even likely. In that case Jesus praised the steward simply for his cleverness, and the parable originally was not intended to show that one must use money well or 'cleverly,' but generally that even the disciples of Jesus were to be 'clever.' One must compare Matt. x. 16, 'Be clever as serpents.' The same word φρόνιμος is used in both passages.

The last words of 8 can hardly be unimportant, but they are not very easy. In what way ought the children of light to show cleverness to the men of their own generation, to the environment in which they live? The way in which they are to show cleverness towards their environment in Matt. x. 16 is scarcely in point here.

It is, however, noticeable that Jesus, the idealist, lays stress on cleverness or prudence. He wanted his disciples to be alert, wide awake, and able to use their opportunities.

In 9 Luke supposes that Jesus gives *his* application of the parable. Luke therefore makes the parable refer not to cleverness generally, but to a wise use of money, which on the assumption that the lord in 8 was, in the source, meant to be Jesus, is not the original meaning of 8.

In 9 the famous phrase occurs: 'the mammon of unrighteousness.' What does this mean? Some say that what is meant is that money has always a taint about it. But if one does possess this unclean thing, the best one can do is to use it wisely, that is, by means of expending it on alms, to obtain from it a heavenly profit. Money, which is the source of sin and usually unrighteous, can yet be so used as to gain admission by it into the heavenly Kingdom.

It may be, however, that we have to suppose that Jesus is speaking, not to the disciples, as it says in xvi. 1, but to the tax-collectors and sinners of xv. 1. Hence the money here spoken of is money unrighteously acquired, not money in general. Jesus means to say: 'If you have obtained money wrongfully, you can, nevertheless, use it in such a way that it may serve you in good stead,' *i.e.* in the way of almsgiving. *Cp.* the story of Zacchæus, xix. 8. Merx advocates this interpretation strongly. 'Mammon of unrighteousness' according to him means strictly: 'wealth unrighteously acquired'—not any kind of wealth. The parable is spoken (xv. 1) to tax-collectors and sinners. If they cannot return their unjustly acquired money, let them use it to make themselves friends with it. He thinks that 'everlasting' in verse 9 is a later insertion, and thus 9 becomes strictly parallel with 4. But surely the resultant sense is tame and poor. 'Help others by your money and so make for yourselves friends.'

J. Weiss adopts the former, more usual interpretation. He says, however: 'whether this condemnation of money is according to the mind of Jesus is exceedingly doubtful, in spite of Mark x. 25.' He further supposes that the whole verse was added to diminish the effect of 8. How could there be anything to praise in the unjust steward? So a sort of counterweight was added. With unrighteous money one can do nothing better than use it in alms as a passport to heaven. This view of mammon, that it is just good enough to secure heavenly bliss with, is in accord with Jewish and Jewish-Christian opinion ('ist ganz jüdisch-judenchristlich empfunden'), and is even to the present day a pillar of that calculating beneficence, which we call 'catholicizing.' There seems a little prepossession here. One would like to hear M. Loisy 'in reply.'

Mr Carpenter thinks that the whole lesson of the parable lies in 9: 'worldly wealth must be employed in alms, so as to secure entry into the dwelling-places of the coming age. The moral quality of the steward's proceedings does not come into view: he simply serves as an illustration of worldly wisdom. In its present form the story seems plainly to belong to that section of the Church which viewed wealth as unrighteous and found merit in poverty. This is closely connected with the conception that the suffering are entitled to compensation, which is seen in the story of the rich man and Lazarus' (*First Three Gospels*, p. 263).

Loisy supposes that 'the lord' in 8 was originally (in the source) Jesus; Luke, to avoid the moral difficulty, would have us believe that the speaker is the 'master' of the parable. The parable originally ended with 8; 9-13 were added later. The original meaning would be that the 'worldly' people show more cleverness in their mundane affairs than those who are more or less really eager for heaven show in setting about getting there. They are not so clever and anxious in securing their eternal welfare as the others are in securing their temporal welfare.

If the parable be authentic, Jesus was not merely thinking of almsgiving. Luke would, however, clearly interpret it in that particular way. (Loisy thinks that the parable is, more probably, a 'transposition peu réussie' of the parable of the pitiless servant in Matt. xviii. 23-35.) The mammon of unrighteousness characterizes wealth in its essential nature, without reference to the method of its acquisition. In the eyes of Jesus, still more in those of Luke, there can be no such a thing as the 'mammon of righteousness.' Nevertheless as the disciples are not rich, it is perhaps the Pharisees to whom the parable was originally addressed.

B. Weiss also supposes that the parable closed with 8. The κύριος in that verse is Jesus. But the purpose of the parable is not to teach the need of legitimate cleverness generally, but to teach that riches are to be rightly used in God's service and for the benefit of one's own future salvation. This right use is not merely limited to almsgiving as Luke (in 9) supposed (*Quellen*, A, p. 249). It constitutes true cleverness (*ib.* B, p. 54).

9. 'And I (Jesus) say unto you.' Use money, the source of so much evil, wisely, so that when you die (this is the meaning of 'when it [the money] fails') you may be received, because of the alms you have given, into heaven. The 'tents' of 9 are parallel to the 'houses' of 4. The verse is a commentary upon 1-8 and was added on to it.

10–13. THE RIGHT USE OF MONEY IS A TEST OF A MAN'S FITNESS FOR THE KINGDOM
(Luke only)

10 'He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in
that which is much: and he that is unjust in what is least is
11 unjust also in what is much. If then ye have not been faithful in
the unrighteous mammon, who will entrust you with the true?
12 And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another's, who
13 will give you that which is your own? No servant can serve two
masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or
else he will cleave to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot
serve God and mammon.'

Luke here makes a sort of correction of the preceding parable. But the verses may belong originally to Q, though Loisy thinks they are the work of Luke who may have deduced them from the parable of the talents (*E. S.* II. p. 164). He desires to show that the last parable must not be misunderstood. The faithlessness of the steward is not commendable: on the contrary, the utmost scrupulosity in money matters is a primary duty.

10. *Cp.* Matt. xxv. 21; Luke xix. 17. Does this mean that he who is faithful in a poor, material thing like money, will be faithful in spiritual wealth as well? Then the thought, as well as the phrasing, would be akin to the parable of the talents. But perhaps 10 merely leads up to 11, if the first interpretation given of 11 is correct. See below.

11. If a man cannot even be trusted with money, how can God trust him with true wealth, that is with heavenly beatitude, the felicity of the Kingdom? The words πιστοί ('faithful') and πιστεύσει ('entrust') seem used in different senses. The verb (on the above interpretation) seems rather to mean 'bestow.' It is also suggested that money is not our own property, just as the money in the hands of the steward, and misspent by him, was not really his. It is only lent us by God that we may make good use of it. *Cp.* the parable of the talents. The true wealth may be God's spiritual gifts, but this seems on the whole, and when 12 is also considered, perhaps a little less likely. The true wealth is probably not a man's spiritual endowment, but in spite of the inappropriateness of the verb (πιστεύσει), if strictly taken, the Messianic Kingdom, or the 'wealth' of heaven. The form ἐγένεσθε demands the translation: 'If ye have not been

faithful.' One surely can hardly render with W.: 'If ye are not faithful.' The question again arises as to the meaning of the 'unrighteous mammon.' Most commentators would say with J. Weiss that it simply means earthly possessions to which some sin always cleaves. But Merx says that the passage refers to wicked officials of the early Christian community, who administer the public funds badly, and to whom the Truth (*i.e.* true doctrine) can still less be entrusted. *τὸ ἀληθινόν* therefore would not mean 'true mammon.' But *τὸ ἡμέτερον* in the next verse would still mean eternal life. 'Während dies auf die christlichen Beamten geht, handelte das Wort 9 von jüdischen Zöllnern: Ältestes und Jüngstes liegen hier nebeneinander.'

12. What is *τὸ ἀλλότριον*? Money may be regarded as 'not yours,' because it is only *lent* by God. It cannot be regarded as your own property. Or, 'for the "children of light" this dark world with all its wealth is something foreign': so Holtzmann. Or, it is foreign because it is external. Or, the verse merely refers to being faithful with other people's property before one can legitimately be entrusted with property of one's own. But this last explanation, which seems to be that of A.V. and R.V., is the least likely of all. After 11 it would be an anti-climax. 12 is more likely to be a pendant to, dealing with the same sort of contrast as, 11. What is 'your own' will be equivalent to that which is called true wealth in 11, *i.e.* the glories of the Messianic Kingdom. If men cannot use the wealth which is only lent to them for a season, they cannot expect that God will grant to them the wealth which is to be eternal, and which, therefore, if they deserve and obtain it, may be rightly described as permanently and truly theirs.

13. This verse, which is also found in Matt. vi. 24, seems merely mechanically connected with 12 by the word 'mammon.'

14–18. PHARISEES AND THE LAW

(*Cp.* Matt. xi. 12, 13, v. 18, 32)

14 And the Pharisees, who love money, heard all these words; and
15 they derided him. And he said unto them, 'Ye are they who
justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for
16 that which is lofty among men is abomination before God. The
Law and the Prophets were until John: since that time the tidings
of the kingdom of God are being preached, and every man is

forcing his way into it. 17 But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of the Law to fail. 18 Whoever divorceth his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whoever marrieth her that is divorced from her husband committeth adultery.

14, 15. Luke only.

Are the Pharisees regarded as the sort of people who are characterized by the unjust steward on the one hand and by the rich man of 19 on the other? Perhaps they are so by Luke who comments on the unjust steward in 11–13, and doubtless 15 looks forward to the rich man of 19, though originally that parable may have been independent of its present setting. It would thus seem that the Pharisees are brought in here by this editorial link in order that it may be clearly understood that the preceding and the succeeding parables are addressed to them. If 19 followed 15 all would be fairly clear. But what are we to make of 16–18? Why are these abrupt and disconnected verses, which occur in such widely separated places in Matthew, suddenly introduced here? Loisy thinks that they were suggested by the mention of 'Moses and the Prophets' in 31. This does not seem very satisfactory.

14. The Pharisees are said to be 'money-loving.' The charge, so far as we know, lacks historical foundation. It is only one more of the attacks by which the Evangelists seek to blacken their Jewish opponents. See Additional Note 25 for a discussion of the matter. We observe, moreover, the constant antagonism of Luke to the rich. The standpoint of Luke and his community is like that of many Psalmists. The needy are the righteous. The rich are the wicked. It is, however, extremely doubtful whether 14 and 15 are connected, as J. Weiss thinks, in that the wealth and prosperity of these men were regarded by themselves and others (according to the Jewish doctrine of retribution) as the proof and sign of their righteousness.

15. The Pharisees are said only to pretend to be righteous. Their hearts are sinful. In the connection in which this verse stands the attack may include or imply the charge of Matt. vi. 2.

16–18. For 16 *cp.* Matt. xi. 12, 13; for 17 *cp.* Matt. v. 18; for 18 *cp.* Matt. v. 32. Conybeare holds that Jesus must have been considerably younger than John, and that the verse about 'from the days of John' is a proof of it. From it we may infer that 'sundry patriots, carried away by John's proclamation of the impending great event which was, among other things, to bring liberation from the Gentile yoke, had tried to hurry it on by active rebellion against the Roman Government. The lessons of their failure were not lost on Jesus, who, like Philo, believed that moral regeneration, repentance, non-resistance, justice and mercy, and in general a faithful observance of the laws of Jehovah, could alone bring it about' (*op. cit.* p. 142).

Why these verses about the Law stand here, or what their exact connection is with that which precedes and follows, is, as I have said above, not very clear. Various explanations have been given; none of them is satisfactory. It is perhaps unnecessary to consider the point further, as it is not very important. As an example of the various explanations suggested I will quote from Loisy: 'As the Law and the Prophets are in question at the end of the following parable where it is declared that the brothers of the rich man have them at their disposal if they wish to repent and amend, and that the resurrection of a dead man would not be more efficacious, it seems that it was wished to prepare for this conclusion by reflections on the duration and value of the Law, reflections which are led up to in some degree by what has just been said with regard to the righteousness of the Pharisees. From the time that the preaching of John gave place to that of the gospel, the end of the Law and the Prophets has come; nevertheless, it is true that the Law will endure to the end of time, but completed by the gospel of which it is the figure. The permanence of the Law must be understood in a typical sense, although, in the source, it was probably taken literally' (*E. S.* II. p. 166). More interesting and more important is the grouping and collocation of the three verses themselves.

16. Matt. xi. 12, but with changes. Luke more decisively than Matthew declares that the era or rule of the Law and the Prophets only lasted till John. And yet Luke even more decisively than Matthew declares that the Law will never fail or fall. (*πίπτειν* is the Greek word, as in 1 Cor. xiii. 8, 'Love never fails.') 'Since that time (literally, from then) the tidings of the Kingdom of God are being preached'—that is, apparently, since the days of John the new Kingdom has been made known and is being realized. Here the Kingdom is not merely future. In one sense men can and do enter into it already. The last four words of the verse are variously interpreted. They may mean, 'Every one is driven or urged in,' as in xiv. 23; or, 'every one can and should force his way in.' So W. Or they may mean, 'People try to get in who are not worthy'; or lastly, 'Every one uses violence against it,' *i.e.* the disciples of the Kingdom (the Christians) are persecuted. The last meaning Loisy thinks, upon the whole, the

most probable. In Matt. xi. 12 not 'every one' but the 'kingdom' is the subject of βιάζεται ('forced'), which is the harder, but therefore, probably, the more original reading.

Thus the breach between the old era and the new era is great. The first is the era of the Law; the second of the Kingdom. The first of preparation; the second of fulfilment.

17. Yet though this be so—though the difference between the days before John and after him be huge—yet the Law is not abolished. Every part of it remains. The gospel fulfils the Law, but it is not antinomian.

What is the meaning of this? Holtzmann says it means that the Law remains for the Jews (if they obeyed it, they could be good instead of bad, and would believe in Christ instead of rejecting him; see verse 29), and it remains for the Christians, in so far as in the Law of Christ the Law of Moses is both maintained and transcended (*überboten*). (This is a Pauline point of view.) W. thinks more simply that the intention is to guard against any directly antinomian and dangerous interpretation of 16. Loisy's explanation is something like Holtzmann's. The true fidelity to the Law is only shown in an obedience to the gospel. He who believes in the Law must believe in the gospel, for the gospel is the fulfilment of the Law. It seems to me clear that these subtle meanings are all later than Jesus himself.

18. The object of putting a variant of Matt. v. 32 immediately after 17 (Matt. v. 18) seems to be to show that what is from one point of view a suspension or violation of the Law is really a fulfilment. Jesus has deepened the Law. What was permitted is now forbidden. The Law has not fallen to the ground; yet it is not the old Law, which is to be kept, but a new and higher Law, which transcends the old. This collocation of 16, 17 and 18 seems to show that Luke himself feels no contradiction between the abrogation and the maintenance of the Law—each in its own sense. To him 18 really confirms 17. Or, perhaps, he *wanted* to feel no contradiction, and the best thing he could do was boldly to assert that abrogation and maintenance and fulfilment by abrogation were all and equally true. The second alternative seems to me somewhat more probable.

There was a constant attempt to achieve the impossible. The Law is eternal and yet temporary; the Law is maintained and yet subverted; the Law is abrogated and yet fulfilled.

The attempt was honest, for these oppositions which are not oppositions, these higher transcendings and reconciliations, have an invincible attraction for a certain order of minds. But in truth no reconciliation is really possible. The attempt was hopeless and is hopeless. If the Law is divine, as it says it is, then no Jesus could abolish it; no Jesus, be he never so good, could fulfil it by subverting it. It is no use to say: 'Jesus neither abolished the Law in one sense nor maintained it in another; yet in a third, and higher sense he both abolished and maintained it.' It is no use to say the truth is neither A nor B, but it is C, which includes and transcends both A and B. Such reasoning may be valid when A and B are complementary to each other, but here they are antagonistic. You cannot have it both ways. If the divine Law is to be maintained, Jews must continue to eat no rabbits; and if they eat rabbits, the divine Law is not maintained. If the divine Law be maintained, then it is not adultery to send away your wife (given certain conditions) and marry another woman; and if it is adultery to do so, then the divine Law is not maintained. Jesus or the Evangelist attempted an impossible reconciliation of irreconcilable opposites.

As regards the character of the statement in 18, it is a combination of Mark x. 11 and Matt. v. 32. As Holtzmann says, it may be the original form. How it combines Mark and Matthew will be made clear thus: Let A and B stand for men, and X and Y for women. Then Matthew and Mark (according to the usual text of Mark) both specify two different cases.

Matthew says:

(1) If A divorce X : X is made an adulteress (if she marry again).
(2) If B thereupon marry X : B is an adulterer.

Mark says:

(1) If A divorce X and marry Y : A is an adulterer.
(2) If X divorce A and marry B : X is an adulteress.

Luke says:

(1) If A divorce X and marry Y : A is an adulterer.
(2) If B thereupon marry X : B is an adulterer.

(In Matt. xix. 9 the text is uncertain.) Thus Luke has the *first* case of Mark x. 11 and the *second* case of Matt. v. 32. The adultery of the woman who marries again is not considered.

19–31. The Story of the Rich and the Poor Man

(Luke only)

19 'There was a rich man, who was clothed in purple and fine
20 linen, and lived joyously and sumptuously every day: and there

was a beggar named Lazarus, who lay at his gate, and was full of
21 sores. And he sought to satisfy his hunger with the bits which
fell from the rich man's table: yea, even the dogs came and licked
22 his sores. And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was
carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also
23 died, and was buried. And he lifted up his eyes in hell, being in
torments, and he saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom.
24 And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and
send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and
25 cool my tongue; for I am in anguish in this flame. But Abraham
said, Son, remember that thou didst receive thy good things in
thy lifetime, and Lazarus similarly received evil things: now he
26 is comforted here, and thou art in anguish. And beside all this,
between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they who
would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to
27 us that would come from thence. So he said, Then I pray thee,
28 father, that thou send him to my father's house,—for I have five
brothers,—so that he may testify unto them, that they may not
29 come also into this place of torment. But Abraham said unto
him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them.
30 And he said, Nay, father Abraham: but if someone went to them
31 from the dead, they would repent. And he said unto him, If they
hear not Moses and the prophets, they will not be persuaded, even
though someone rose from the dead.'

The story is hardly a parable. It is a story with a moral. Some (*e.g.* Plummer) think that its intention—at least, the intention of the first part, 19–25—is to illustrate the results of the wrong use of money, and by contrast to bring comfort to the poor and the oppressed. Or it may be that the story is intended to illustrate verse 15. See below. B. Weiss supposes that the story is taken from L. The original story was probably intended to teach a somewhat different moral than is indicated in either of the above hypotheses. Its author (not, I should think, Jesus) wants to illustrate and contrast the present and future lot of wealth and poverty. Let not the poor envy the rich. For though at present the poor man has sorrow and the rich man comfort and prosperity, in the next world these conditions shall be reversed. For in truth, the poor they shall be happy; the rich they shall be miserable. The point of view is the same as we have already met with in some of the special material of Luke. The rich are the oppressors;

the poor are the oppressed. Neither 'deserve' their present lot: in the world to come this lot will be permanently changed, for those now poor shall then enjoy the highest good, while those now rich shall be in the sorest distress.

20. The poor man is given a name. Why is this? The name may have been added by Luke. Or the name may have been added to the story as already in Luke. Or the story of Lazarus as given in John may have been already in circulation. Or the story in John may partly depend upon the parable in Luke. Or is the identity of names a mere coincidence? Is the name merely given to suit the situation: Lazarus = Eleazar = God is his (only) help? There seems no reason why Jesus should not have occasionally have given a proper name to one of the *dramatis personæ* of his parables.

21. What fell from the table were the big bits of bread which were used to clean or dry the hands after the eaters had dipped them, for example, in a dish full of bits of meat and gravy. Napkins were not used for the hands. The guests wiped their hands on bits of bread, and then threw the pieces under the table. The poor man wanted to eat these pieces, but the dogs anticipated him. The licking of his sores adds to the sadness of the situation. It is not said that the rich man was bad and cruel, or that the poor man was good: but this is implied.

22. What was 'borne' by the angels? His soul? And yet a corporeal sort of soul if it had fingers (24). For the eschatology of the story and its agreement with, and divergence from, average Rabbinic doctrine see Additional Note 55.

23. The Greek word 'Hades' here equals hell or Gehenna. Abraham is in heaven or Paradise, and close by him is Lazarus. His place is a distinction. From hell one can see Paradise, and the distance is apparently not too great for conversation. But really there is a 'great gulf' between the two. And if from hell one can see Paradise, and if an inmate of the one can make himself heard by a denizen of the other, this is only, as Loisy says, 'because the laws of the other world are not the same as ours.' The story follows the second main strand of popular belief in the hereafter. Instead of waiting, all alike, in Hades or Sheol, till the Resurrection and the last Judgment, the good and bad are judged at once. Straightway after death, the good go to heaven, the bad to hell. For the meaning of the term 'Abraham's bosom' see Additional Note 56.

24. Hell is painted very materially: there are physical flames.

25. Abraham's argument is simple. He who fares well in this world must fare ill in the next and *vice versa*. You cannot have a good time in both worlds, so you have nothing to complain of. It is not said, though it is implied, that the rich man was bad or that Lazarus was good; the question, what should happen to a good rich man or to a bad poor one is ignored; nor is the inequality of temporal happiness being balanced by eternal misery thought of. The story takes up the point of view of Luke vi. 21, 24. 'Happy are the poor; woe to the rich.'

The extreme simplicity or childishness of Abraham's reply is partly accounted for by the fact that the story is only concerned to warn the rich and comfort the poor. But it would nevertheless seem as if the story has either been enlarged or as if there was a certain inconsistency of treatment. The rich man is not merely *deprived* of heaven, but he suffers pains in hell. It is not merely a question of compensation, but of punishment. Thus J. Weiss not unjustifiably says: 'The assumption is suddenly made (of which hitherto there has been no suggestion) that, like his five brothers, the rich man is wicked and unrepentant; this assumption puts before us a quite new line of thought (*eine ganz neue Betrachtungsweise*), namely the conceptions peculiar to the special source exploited by Luke (*die Sonder-Ueberlieferung*) [B. Weiss's L]: Lazarus is the type of a "poor man," not in the sense of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, that is to say, one of those meek ones upon the earth whom Jesus is to gather into his fold, but rather in the sense of Luke's Sermon on the Mount, that is, he is a type of poor, oppressed, and persecuted Christians. And the rich man is no longer the type of a prosperous, satiated, satisfied man, but of an unbelieving opponent of the Christian community in the sense of the "woes" of Luke's Sermon. This line of thought is continued in the second part of the parable; the "five brothers" are types of unbelieving, unrepentant Judaism. The supposition of the rich man, that they too would probably come to the place of torment, is also that of the narrator.'

We may, however, more simply suppose that the parable is spoken from the point of view that the rich are usually bad, the poor usually good. In some of the Psalms 'the poor and needy' are synonymous with the righteous. We must not assume that the rich man was specially cruel; as Merx says, the fact that Lazarus lay at the rich man's door shows that he often got something, otherwise he would have taken up his quarters elsewhere.

The eschatology and the details of the word-painting seem unlike those habitual to Jesus. If he ever spoke the parable, it has been altered since he spoke it. 'Jésus,' as Loisy says, 'ne semble pas s'être complu dans la description de l'au-delà; il annonçait l'avènement du règne de Dieu sur la terre, non la translation des pauvres dans le sein d'Abraham' (*E. S.* II. p. 174).

B. Weiss (*Quellen*, A, p. 251) thinks that the reason of the rich man's fate was that he had not repented: he was an example and illustration of verse 15. For 15 is from the special source L, and was there immediately followed by the parable. Exalted among men, this unrepentant man was an abomination before God. He is merely described as rich because it is riches which most frequently make a man thought 'hoch bevorzugt.' B. Weiss, moreover, holds that in L the parable of the prodigal son was followed by 14 in a shortened form. Luke it was who added the two Greek words about the Pharisees' love of money, in order to make a better connection with the parable of the unjust steward which he had inserted from Q. What the Pharisees really sneered at was the blame contained in the parable of the prodigal son for their attitude towards 'sinners' and for their criticism of Jesus's attitude towards them. Then verse 15 continues in the same strain. The Pharisees are self-righteous, but in reality as unrepentant, though as much needing repentance, as the rich man in the parable which follows. It is quite inaccurate to suppose that the parable of Lazarus and the beggar has to do with the right use of money. There is much which is ingenious in all this, but as a whole it is doubtful. It is surely exaggerated to say that 29, 30 show 'quite unmistakably' that the rich man had prepared his own fate because he had not repented, and was therefore an abomination unto God. The bias against wealth, its facile identification with sin, are more obvious than Weiss will allow.

26–31. These verses seem undoubtedly an addendum. The rich man with his brothers becomes the type of the unbelieving Jews, and the object of the addition is to show the inexcusability of their unbelief.

26. ἐπὶ (or ἐν) πᾶσι τούτοις. Apparently this means 'moreover.'

There is no passing from hell to heaven. He who is once in hell will always remain there. A truly horrible doctrine, yet there is no reason to believe that Jesus, like other good men of his age, did not hold and teach it.

27. There is no intention to show that because the rich man thinks of his brothers and would like to save them, therefore he is morally improving. In any case, repentance after death—such is the general doctrine of the time—is of no avail. The object of the rich man's request is merely to lead up to 29 and 31.

28. 'Testify' of his miserable condition; or 'testify' here may equal 'warn.'

29. Moses and the Prophets could have told them how to avoid the pains of hell. For properly understood, Moses and the Prophets testify to Jesus the Messiah. Had the Jews hearkened to Moses and the Prophets, they would not have rejected Jesus.

30. It is here implied that the brothers, like the rich man himself, were bad people, and needed repentance.

31. Literally this verse only says that they who do not believe in Moses and the Prophets would not believe in a messenger from the dead. But the allusion and intention are pretty clear: the Jews do not rightly believe in Moses and the Prophets, because they do not believe in the risen Christ. They profess to believe in Moses and the Prophets specially and in them only; in reality their vaunted belief is misbelief or unbelief. For true belief in Moses leads to true belief in Christ. Here we have exemplified the impossibility of compromise and understanding between the orthodox Jew and the orthodox Christian. To each, orthodoxy is my doxy. (Merx tries—to my mind, very unsuccessfully—to show that there is no allusion whatever to the resurrection of Jesus.)

The story of Lazarus has, as Mr Carpenter observes, 'many peculiar features which mark it off from the parables of the Teacher.' 'No *moral* reason is assigned for the different lots of the rich man and Lazarus in the next world; their positions are reversed on the simple principle that the one received his good things in the earthly life, the other evil; and this inequality must be redressed.' 'The designation of the beggar by name is a unique departure from the habit of presenting only types; the description of the realms beyond death is without parallel in the reserve with which the conditions of the future are elsewhere veiled' (*First Three Gospels*, p. 261). B. Weiss, not wholly unreasonably, thinks the allusion to the raising of Lazarus unmistakable. Hence the quite exceptional fact that the chief character is given a name.

CHAPTER XVII

1, 2. ON SCANDALS OR STUMBLING-BLOCKS

(*Cp.* Mark ix. 42; Matt. xviii. 6, 7)

1 And he said unto the disciples, 'It is impossible that stumbling-blocks should not come: but woe unto him, through whom they
2 come! It would profit him more that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones.

The Pharisees are dismissed: the teaching returns to the disciples. The order of 1 and 2 reverses that in Matthew.

3, 4. ON FORGIVENESS

(*Cp.* Matt. xviii. 15, 21, 22)

3 'Take heed to yourselves. If thy brother have sinned, rebuke
4 him; and if he repent, forgive him. And if he sin against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him.'

Luke contracts Matthew. There seems little reason to assume with B. Weiss that these verses are taken from a 'selbständige Parallel-überlieferung' in L rather than from Q. The same may be said as regards 5, 6.

5, 6. ON FAITH

(*Cp.* Matt. xvii. 20, xxi. 21; Mark xi. 22, 23)

5, 6 And the apostles said unto the Lord, 'Increase our faith.' And the Lord said, 'If ye had faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye would say unto this mulberry tree, Be uprooted, and planted in the sea; and it would obey you.

The connection is obscure. B. Weiss suggests one which is too subtle to quote (*Quellen*, A, p. 253). Luke omits the barren fig tree passage of Mark xi.; but his substitution of the 'mulberry' (literally, 'sycamine') for the 'mountain' may show his knowledge of it. The saying about faith probably occurred in Q, and Luke had both Q and Mark before him. In Mark the injunction to have faith immediately follows the story of the barren fig tree.

7–10. The Slave and his Reward

(Luke only)

7 'But which of you, having a servant ploughing or feeding
cattle, will say unto him on his return from the field, Come and
8 straightway sit down to table? Will he not rather say unto him,
Get ready my supper, and gird thyself, and serve me, while I eat
and drink; and afterwards thou canst eat and drink thyself?
9 Doth he thank that servant because he did what he was ordered?
10 So too ye, when ye have done all that which ye have been ordered
to do, say, We are [useless] servants: we have merely done that
which it was our duty to do.'

A highly noble, notable and important passage. Its connection with what precedes it is not apparent. The connection made up by B. Weiss is strained. As to the source, Loisy assumes Q, and Weiss L. The illustration is taken from ordinary life, not the ideal life of the Kingdom (*cp.* xii. 37), but yet not the life of bad people. Its essence lies in 9. The application and moral in 10 are much improved if with the S.S. we omit the adjective 'useless.' For the stress lies on the *noun* 'servants' or 'slaves'; not on the quality of the slaves. The religious relation between man and God is directly and emphatically stated to be that of master and slave. We are no better than servants. We have responsibility and duties, but no right to, or claim upon, reward. Whatever good a man does, he cannot do more than he owes to God. For to him he owes all that he is capable of doing. He cannot acquire a right to thanks.

In the first place it is most important to notice that Jesus is not afraid to speak of our relation to God as that of master and slave. What grand use would have been made of this passage by the German Protestant theologians had it stood in the Talmud! How it would have proved the servile, cringing, frightened character of Rabbinic religion! Jesus taught that God was man's Father; the Rabbis that man was God's slave! As a matter of fact both

Jesus and the Rabbis taught from different points of view and in different moods both one and the other. Neither is false.

In the second place it is most notable that man can claim no reward from God. That was not quite original teaching, but it was so relatively. The tilt against exaggerations and perversions of the doctrine of tit-for-tat is a prominent and characteristic feature of the teaching of Jesus. What we receive from God is grace and goodness, and not reward. There is no doubt that the excessive emphasis and elaboration of the doctrine of retribution was one of the weak spots in Rabbinic Judaism. In no other point is Jesus's antagonism to, and reaction against, certain tendencies in that teaching more justified and more wholesome than here.

9. Instead of 'does he thank that servant,' Merx shows that there is good reason to suppose that the original reading was: 'Has he (the servant) any favour (*i.e.* in the sight of his master) because he did what he was told?' Does he acquire any special favour or merit? The sense is improved by this reading. For this use of *χάριν ἔχειν* Acts ii. 47 supplies a parallel.

11–19. THE HEALING OF THE TEN LEPERS

(Luke only)

11 And it came to pass, as he journeyed to Jerusalem, that he
12 passed between Samaria and Galilee. And as he entered into a
certain village, there met him ten men that were lepers, who stood
13 afar off, and lifted up their voices, and said, 'Jesus, Master, have
14 pity upon us.' And when he saw them, he said unto them, 'Go
show yourselves unto the priests.' And it came to pass, that, as
15 they went, they were cleansed. And one of them, when he saw
that he was healed, turned back, and with a loud voice glorified
16 God. And he fell down on his face at his feet, giving him thanks.
17 Now he was a Samaritan. And Jesus said, 'Were not the ten
18 cleansed? where are the nine? Were none found to return and
19 give glory to God except this foreigner?' And he said unto him,
'Arise, go thy way: thy faith hath saved thee.'

The story is a variant to the healing of the leper in Luke v. 12–16; Mark i. 40–45; Matt. viii. 1–4. It is told with a marked universalist or anti-Jewish tendency. The source in B. Weiss's opinion is L. The connection with what has preceded is obscure and doubtful.

11. The situation—the journey to Jerusalem—is recalled. Jesus was proceeding on his journey, being on the frontiers of Samaria and Galilee. This seems the meaning of the odd Greek. Apparently he passes along the border of Samaria, going from west to east towards the Jordan. From its place in the narrative one would rather suppose that Jesus was nearing Jerusalem (Loisy).

14. Jesus heals them from afar, as Elisha heals Naaman. Whether this is done, as Loisy thinks, so that Jesus may not heal a leprous Samaritan by actual contact, inasmuch as he did not historically preach the gospel to Samaritans and Gentiles, seems to me doubtful. But doubtless the healing of the Samaritan typifies and represents the conversion of the Gentiles, while the nine ungrateful Jews represent unbelieving Judaism. Was there any real fact behind the story? It is doubtful.

15. Are we to assume that the *Samaritan*, like the nine, had to present himself in Jerusalem to a *Jewish* priest and make an offering?

17. Usually Jesus is not anxious to receive thanks: here he must be made to wish for them, so that the Samaritan may excel (W.). The 'nine others' represent the ungrateful Jews who saw the miracles and benefited by them, and were yet impassive to the teaching and appeal of Jesus.

19. *Cp.* vii. 50, viii. 48. But were not the nine others also healed? Was their faith less or the same? There must be a confusion in the narrative. One good MS. omits the second half of the verse. Or we may suppose that the nine others are forgotten. The tenth typifies the conversion and salvation of the Gentiles. He only is therefore of importance to the Evangelist. Loisy (*E. S.* II. p. 182) is disposed to think that the story is taken by Luke from some 'source.' It is not purely his own invention. It is not purely an allegoric doublet, as some suppose, of the leper story chronicled by Mark. Yet its main purpose is symbolic, and its historical character is very dubious. The ten lepers must be put in the same category as the young man of Nain, as the woman cured on the Sabbath (xiii. 11) and as the man with the dropsy (xiv. 2).

20–37. The When and Where of the Parousia

(*Cp.* Matt. xxiv. 26, 27, 37–39, x. 39, xxiv. 40, 41, 28)

20 And being questioned by the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God would come, he answered them and said, 'The kingdom

21 of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo
here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is among you.'
22 And he said unto the disciples, 'The days will come, when ye
will desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall
23 not see it. And they shall say to you, Lo there, lo here: go not
24 after them, nor follow them. For as the lightning flashing from one
side under the heaven, shineth unto the other side, so shall the Son
25 of man be in his day. But first he must suffer much, and be
26 rejected by this generation. And as it was in the days of Noah, so
27 shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. They kept on
eating, drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day
that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed
28 them all. Likewise as it was in the days of Lot; they kept on
29 eating, drinking, buying, selling, planting and building; but on
the day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone
30 from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be
31 on the day when the Son of man is revealed. In that day, he who
shall be upon the roof, and his goods in the house, let him not come
down to take them away: and so too let not him that is in the
33 field, turn back. Remember Lot's wife. Whoever seeketh to save
his life shall lose it; and whoever shall lose his life shall preserve
34 it. I tell you, in that night there shall be two men in one bed;
35 the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left. Two women
shall be grinding at the same mill; the one shall be taken, and the
37 other left.' And they answered and said unto him, 'Where, Lord?'
And he said unto them, 'Where the corpse is, there too will the
vultures be gathered together.'

Much of this section contains parallels to Matt. xxiv. The same subject is treated of again (xxi.) with parallels to Mark xiii. Matthew has combined what Luke has here with Mark's apocalyptic oration (xiii.), though, as Loisy says, the 'eschatological perspective' is very different. For, in Mark, the question as to the time when the coming will take place is more or less replied to: here the time is stated to be unforeseeable. The section comes from a source common to Matthew and Luke, and as it is in full accordance with the point of view of the parables dealing with the right preparation for the Kingdom, Loisy says it must be regarded as 'in substance' authentic.

The section is divided into two unequal parts. In the first

(20, 21), which has no parallels in Matthew and Mark, Jesus speaks to the Pharisees; in the second to the disciples. Yet what he says to the Pharisees would seem more suited for the disciples, and some would hold that the Pharisees are due to a less intelligent editor.

20, 21. Luke only. These verses are very famous. For our purpose and for Jewish readers their importance is comparatively small, but if we could know (which we never can) whether Jesus really said 21, and, if so, what he meant by it, it would be intensely interesting. Loisy (for various reasons) regards the two verses as probably entirely composed by Luke to serve as an introduction to what follows.

20. 'When the Kingdom of God would come.' Jesus answers, first of all, that the Kingdom does not come 'with observation' (*μετὰ παρατηρήσεως*). This seems to mean that you cannot predict its exact moment of coming: waiting and watching and observing the reported 'signs' will not make it come. I do not see that this statement contradicts, as Holtzmann thinks it does, 24. For if, with no preparation, the Advent will take place as suddenly as a flash of lightning, it is reasonable to say that it is idle to watch for it or to observe preparatory or premonitory signs: there will be no such signs. Loisy's interpretation is slightly different. 'The coming of the Kingdom will not be preceded by any signs by which one might be prepared for or recognize its coming.' Note that Jesus is asked *when* will the Kingdom come: he answers *how* it will come. 'The thoughts of the person who gave the question its present shape were fixed on the delay in the Parousia and with what was to happen before it; hence he replies to 'when' by *how*. If he had had in mind a spiritual and moral coming of the Kingdom, the exchange of remarks which he relates would be based upon an ambiguity, since the Pharisees would understand the coming of the Kingdom in the ordinary and eschatological sense of this formula, while Jesus would understand it in the moral sense, without any reference to eschatology' (*E. S.* II. p. 402).

21. The first part of this verse corresponds in the words, 'lo here, lo there,' with Mark xiii. 21. The words here mean that one cannot tell in advance that the Kingdom has been manifested in this place or that. The words are more suitable to the Messiah than to the Kingdom, and are applied to him in verse 23. The second part of the verse is very peculiar and interesting. The words of it are very famous. There are two main interpretations:

(1) The first is to take 'within you' as equivalent to 'among you,' as if the expression were *ἐν μέσῳ*. The Kingdom, according

to this interpretation, is present in the same sense as in xi. 20: it is already 'here,' though not yet perfected. To this view the chief objections are:

(*a*) That the phrase used is *ἐντός ὑμῶν* and not *ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν*—'within' and not 'among you.'

(*b*) A local interpretation or fixity of the Kingdom has been denied in the first part of the verse. Of the Kingdom they will not say, 'It is here or there,' *i.e.* it is not *locally* fixable.

(*c*) If the meaning is that the Kingdom is already in your midst—that it has already begun—though ye know it not, why is the future used? Why are the words, 'Neither shall they say' ('they' is impersonal), instead of, 'it cannot be said'?

It does not seem to me that these objections are very serious. The third is equally relevant to the other, more favoured and more spiritual interpretation.

(2) The other main interpretation is to translate: 'the Kingdom of God is within you,' by which is meant that the Kingdom is not something outward or material or local, but a spiritual principle, which works unseen, and regenerates, in the hearts of men. W. adopts this interpretation, and he compares the Kingdom as here described with the view of it taken in xiii. 21 as the leaven within the meal.

It is natural that the modern commentator who likes to pare off from Jesus's teaching as much of the miraculous, or 'Jewish,' or political, or 'material' element as he can, and to read into or out of it as much spiritual, universalist and permanent teaching as possible, is often keen to adopt and justify this interpretation.

But it has its difficulties:

(*a*) The saying is specially directed to the Pharisees, and not to the disciples.

(*b*) It has no clear parallels elsewhere.

(*c*) It does not account for the future tense in *ἐροῦσιν*.

(*d*) Its meaning is not only obscure (for in what sense can the Kingdom be said to be 'in' a man?), but, as J. Weiss so well and strongly urges, it misconceives the significance of the term to Jesus and his contemporaries. To them the Kingdom was something objective, epoch-making, world-embracing, implying the downfall of the present world-order, and the judgment and rule of God.

To avoid (*a*) and (*c*) Holtzmann suggests that parts of 20 and 21 are due to an editor: the original saying ran: 'Being questioned when the Kingdom of God would come, he replied, The Kingdom does not come by watching: for it is within you.'

J. Weiss, who is such an energetic defender of the 'eschatological' and 'objective' interpretation of the Kingdom, is naturally keen to translate ἐντός by 'among.' In what sense the Kingdom is already among you is another matter. It does not necessarily mean that the disciples represent the Kingdom. 'Unser Logion lässt durchaus nicht erkennen an was für Anfänge Jesus denkt und es ist Willkür, hier etwas Bestimmtes anzunehmen.' J. Weiss supposes that Jesus desires to rebuke any apocalyptic attempts to fix the exact coming and date of the Kingdom. One cannot say: 'lo here or there' as proofs or signs of its advent. [J. Weiss does not perhaps sufficiently appreciate the difficulty of the future ἐροῦσιν.] On the contrary: unknown to those who seek to watch and observe (as you might observe the signs of a storm or an eclipse), the beginnings of the Kingdom are already among them. The kingdom of Satan, as Jesus had already said, is falling or has fallen. Therefore the Kingdom of God has already begun. One *will* not be able to say 'It is there,' for without such observations and vaticinations and reckonings, behold, it has already begun in your midst.

Yet elsewhere Jesus seems to think that men ought at all events to be able to estimate the signs of the times aright, *e.g.* xii. 56.

Pfleiderer holds that 22 *seq.* are so completely opposed to 21 (which he thinks can only mean 'within you') that the only explanation is to assume that 20 and 21 are due to Luke himself (*cp.* Romans xiv. 17), and were prefixed to the following speech to damp apocalyptic impatience: the dangers of eschatological enthusiasm (against which a warning is given in 23), seemed only to be quite warded off by substituting for apocalyptic catastrophes the inner spiritual presence of the divine Kingdom. Thus 20 and 21 show a transition to the theory of Immanence as we find it in the fourth Gospel; a similar transition may be noted in Matt. xxviii. 20 and xviii. 20.

In view of the fact that ἔρχεται must mean 'will come' in the question asked, and that ἐροῦσιν is future, the best interpretation is, perhaps, to suppose that ἔστιν in 21 is inaccurate. It should be ἔσται. 'No one will be able to say, Lo here or lo there; there will be no premonitory signs; but suddenly will the Kingdom appear and be among you.' And this is also the interpretation of Loisy. He rejects the 'spiritual' explanation. 'The abstract idea of a wholly spiritual and moral presence of the Kingdom in the hearts of men is, moreover, foreign to the Gospel and it may be said to the whole Bible.' One must translate 'among you.' Does it mean that the manifestation of the Kingdom is hard at hand? Or does it mean what is expressed in Luke x. 9 and xi. 20?

Loisy rejects both interpretations, for both would make the passage wanting in naturalness and clearness. 'The idea is rather that no one need be anxious to know whether the Kingdom has arrived in this place or in that, because, when it comes, it will be suddenly present to all. According to this interpretation Luke has simply taken from the discourse which follows an answer to the question "when," substituting a statement about the absence of precursory signs for the avowal of ignorance about the day and the hour of the great coming. Thus understood, the answer is in perfect conformity with the teaching of Jesus, and it is of little importance that one cannot say positively whether it is in itself authentic, or if it has been inferred from the discourse for which it is now meant to prepare' (*E. S.* II. pp. 403, 404).

22. Here the speech to the disciples begins, but 22 is also only found in Luke. Apparently this verse seems to imply that there has been a long and vain waiting for the Advent. To see the mere beginning of his coming, the first day of it, and then to die, would be a comfort, and a proof of the truth of their religion, to the Christians, but they must not hope for this, and must nevertheless be firm in their faith. So W.

23–25. *Cp.* Matt. xxiv. 26, 27.
The coming of the Messiah from heaven will be a universal event, known to and realized by all the world at once.

25. Luke only. It does not belong to the old apocalyptic material. Note how, on the contrary, in 24 and 30, Jesus seems to distinguish himself from the Son of man, and seems to employ current apocalyptic conceptions and terms. Even though 'Son of man' may sometimes be an error for 'man,' on other occasions it looks as if there must have been current an apocalyptic figure, known as 'The Man'—*i.e.* the heavenly, or Messianic Man. Verse 25 seems interpolated; it breaks the connection, and is quite out of place.

26, 27. *Cp.* Matt. xxiv. 37–39.

28–32. Luke only. But *cp.* Mark xiii. 14–16; Matt. xxiv. 17, 18.

30. The Son of man is 'revealed' from heaven.

31. The 'flight' is in place in Mark xiii. 15, 16; here it is not. One cannot flee from the Messiah. The verses must be half allegorically interpreted of a flight from everything which is

material; the ready abandonment of all earthly property. There must be no looking back to it longingly, as Lot's wife looked back.

33. *Cp.* ix. 24; Mark viii. 35; Matt. x. 39. Even life itself may have to be readily abandoned in order to receive the heavenly life of the perfected Kingdom. This apparently must be the meaning of this verse as here placed. But it seems misplaced. The moment of the Parousia is not a time in which life can be saved or won. The opportunity for choice has passed.

34. 'Taken'; *i.e.* saved. 'Left'; *i.e.* abandoned to the Judgment.

35–37. (36 is wanting in the best MSS.) *Cp.* Matt. xxiv. 40, 41, 28.

37. *Cp.* Matt. xxiv. 28. In this connection the words apparently mean that where there are people to punish, there the Advent and the Judgment will be. So interpreted the verse is not necessarily inconsistent with 24, as W. thinks, who takes it to mean a restriction of the Advent to one particular spot, which will make itself as apparent as vultures make known the locality of corpses. More probably Luke has put the verse in the wrong place to end up the chapter. Its meaning to him is the same as the meaning in Matthew.

CHAPTER XVIII

1–8. The Parable of the Unjust Judge

(Luke only)

1 And he spoke a parable unto them to show that they ought
2 always to pray, and not to lose heart: 'There was in a certain city
3 a judge, who neither feared God, nor regarded man: and there was
a widow in that city; and she came unto him, saying, Avenge me
4 upon mine adversary. And for a time he would not do so; but
afterwards he said to himself, Even though I fear not God, nor
5 regard man; yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge
6 her, lest at last she should come and hit me in the face.' And the
7 Lord said, 'Hear what the unjust judge saith. And shall not God
avenge his own elect, who cry day and night unto him, while he is
8 longsuffering to their enemies? I tell you that he will avenge
them speedily.

'Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, will he find faith on the earth?'

B. Weiss, *Quellen*, A, p. 88, argues that this section was taken from Q. Verse 8 shows its connection with what has preceded.

Though the hour of the Advent is uncertain, nevertheless it is right that Christians should pray unceasingly for its fulfilment. Moreover it will certainly come.

There are difficulties in the passage. First of all in verse 1, the meaning seems to be a general order that the disciples are to be tireless in prayer; it does not seem to be a special injunction that they are to pray ceaselessly for the Judgment.

Hence it might seem as if this was the original intention of the parable as well as of verse 1. The section would then be a complete parallel to xi. 5–8 (the parable of the importunate friend). There are consequently two views about the present parable. Some think that, like that of the importunate friend, it was originally meant to teach the general duty of prayer. It had no direct reference to the Judgment. The verses 6–8 were added later. But in this case the character of the parable itself seems, as W. says, 'strangely chosen.' More probable is it that verse 1 is the composition of Luke, and is meant to give an (erroneously) general application to a specifically intended parable. 6–8 *a* belong to 1–5 and cohere with it. The parable was not meant to teach the general duty of prayer. It was intended to show that God would not delay to carry out the Messianic Judgment in answer to the continued prayers of true believers. The enemies of the community shall surely be punished. There seems to be a pretty certain borrowing from Sirach xxxiv. 15–19—a passage which also speaks of the judgment and the punishment of enemies. Moreover, W. supposes that xi. 5–8 is secondary and later than xviii. 1–8. The order to pray constantly for revenge seemed un-Christian and was changed into a general injunction of constant prayer. And verse 1 was added, or modified into its present form. All this is, however, pure conjecture.

The enemies whom God through the Messiah at his Advent will punish are the Jews. W. makes the following remark:

'Indem die Christen Rache an ihnen heischen, stecken sie freilich selber noch im Judentum.'

How far is this just or unjust? It implies that Christianity is a religion of forgiveness, Judaism of revenge.

Is this accurate? The true answer is, I think, that it is inaccurate.

As regards the private foes of the individual, the Old Testament and the Talmud counsel forgiveness and reconciliation as much as the New Testament.

As regards the foes of the community and of the religion, we have to distinguish. It is, I think, true that the Old Testament and Rabbinic Judaism do regularly ask God to punish the enemies of the Jewish race and of the Jewish religion. It is also true that in Matt. v. 44 we have the noble words, 'Pray for those that persecute you: love your enemies,' to which we have to add the parallel Luke vi. 27, 28, the grand sentences in Acts vii. 60, Luke xxiii. 34, and the great sayings in Romans xii. 14, 19–21, 1 Peter ii. 23, iii. 9.

It would therefore be, I think, true to say that the highest teaching of the New Testament does in this respect go beyond the Old Testament and the Talmud. It would be true to say that there are a few passages in the New Testament which enjoin that the enemies of the Christian community and of the Christian religion are to be loved and well treated and prayed for.

But as these few injunctions have been a dead letter throughout the ages, and as in the New Testament itself there are other passages which threaten the enemies of the Christian community and of the Christian religion with endless and awful divine punishment, and call them many bad and uncharitable names, it seems exaggerated to call Christianity a religion of forgiveness and Judaism a religion of revenge.

In practice Christians have rarely, if ever, shown love and forgiveness to heretics or to the supposed enemies of their religion, nor have they said: 'We know our religion teaches us to forgive and be kind. We know we ought to be loving, but human nature is too strong for us.' On the contrary, they have regarded themselves as good Christians even amid their cruelty, as we see in all anti-Semitism to-day. The claim that Christianity therefore is so much superior to Judaism as regards public enemies can hardly be sustained, while as regards private enemies their teaching is identical. I fully admit that the New Testament does contain these few noble and original passages about the enemies of the community and of the religion, but they are counterbalanced by other passages, and they have always remained a dead letter. A religion must be judged by its fruits. As Christians have shown hatred and cruelty in the most conspicuous degree to those who differ from them in matters of religious dogma, it is almost absurd to call Christianity a religion of forgiveness. Therefore, as it seems to me, W.'s antithesis sounds well, but is inaccurate.

3. *Cp.* Sirach xxxv. 15. Here is the origin of the parable.

6. The curious way in which a parable can be constructed is markedly illustrated by this instance. It throws light upon the parable of the unjust steward. For the judge is God, and yet he is an unjust judge. The parable is merely used for its incidental point: incessant prayer produces a result. That in all other respects the judge is in character and action quite unfit to be God's human parallel does not matter. Note the special call to attention in the opening of this verse. 'The lord' is here Jesus. *Cp.* the note on xvi. 8, 9.

7. The parallel is not exact, for it is not *merely because* of the prayers of the elect that God will punish their foes. But this inexactness is overlooked. Though God might and would act independently of human prayer, man is nevertheless to pray. *καὶ μακροθυμεῖ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς.* *Cp.* Sirach xxxv. 18. It means either: 'And should he delay (His vengeance) [indefinitely] for them?' ('them' being the elect), or 'shall He still be longsuffering to them (*i.e.* to the wicked)?'

8. God is the judge. Yet in the last part of this verse He seems to act through the Messiah. Perhaps this is meant throughout. Or, if not, then (with W.), 8 *b* (from 'nevertheless') may be a later addition. So too Völter. It seems to be a warning. 'It is all very well for you to desire and pray for the Advent, but how is it with *yourselves*? Will the Christ find right faith among *you* when he comes? Will *you* be able to endure his day?' The words seem a sort of damper upon the jubilant expectancy of the rest of the passage. So W., who aptly compares Malachi iii. 2. Otherwise we must suppose that the Evangelist wishes to imply that the cause for the delay of the Parousia is the lack of faith among Christians and of that joyousness and constancy in prayer which spring from it.

The whole section seems to reflect a time of persecution, and to be therefore later than Jesus.

'This parable is the last of the sections in Luke which some critics have called "Ebionite fragments"—namely, the parable of the unfortunate friend (xi. 5–8); the parable of the rich man and the abundant harvest (xii. 16–21); the warnings to take the lowest place at table and to invite the poor and the rich (xiv. 7–14); the parable of the unjust steward (xvi. 1–12); the story of the rich man and Lazarus (xvi. 19–31); and lastly this parable of the unjust judge. As we find in them all the same contempt of riches and love of poverty, the same ascetic spirit, and the same use of persons who are not good in themselves, but from whom nevertheless a moral lesson is drawn, some critics have concluded that they all must be derived from the same source—and the more so because several of them show analogies and parallels in form as well as in substance. But the spirit of all these sections is the same as that of the rest of the gospel, especially of Luke, and one is not obliged to hold that none of them was known to Matthew. The difficulty of interpreting them allegorically, or the very impossibility of holding up the persons or actions contained in them as models for imitation, are adequate reasons why the redactor of Matthew should have omitted them' (*E. S.* II. p. 185). This is interesting, but it is doubtful to me whether Loisy's argument will hold. He is too anxious to argue that Matthew knew, but suppressed, the parables which are only found in Luke. The motive is doubtless that they may be assigned—or most of them at least—to Jesus. It may, however, be noted that B. Weiss only assigns two of these particular sections to L, namely, xiv. 7–14 and xvi. 19–31. All the rest he assigns (for reasons which it would take too long to quote here) to Q. Thus for four out of the six passages B. Weiss, quite independently, agrees with Loisy.

9–14. THE TAX-COLLECTOR AND THE PHARISEE
(Luke only)

9 And he spoke this parable in respect of some who were self
10 confident that they were righteous, and despised others: 'Two
men went up into the temple to pray; the one a Pharisee, and
11 the other a tax-collector. The Pharisee stood and prayed by
himself thus: God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are,
12 extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or also like this tax-collector. I
13 fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess. But the
tax-collector stood at a distance, and would not even lift up his eyes
unto heaven, but kept smiting his breast, saying, God be gracious
14 to me the sinner. I tell you, this man went down to his house
justified rather than the other: for every one that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that abaseth himself shall be
exalted.'

The connection seems to be (if there is one) either, when you pray, pray like the tax-collector rather than the Pharisee; or, think of your own sins and not only of the badness and punishment of others. We have here a type of story (hardly a parable) like xvi. 19–31. Apart from its context, it had clearly a more general meaning. Not self-righteous pride, but repentant humility, is acceptable in the eyes of God. Is the source Q or L (B. Weiss)?

9. Who are the persons alluded to? Doubtless Pharisees, but perhaps they are not named, because a Pharisee is a figure in the story. The verse is, we may presume, the Evangelist's own introduction to a story which he found in one of his sources.

11. 'Other men.' On the one side are the Pharisee and his like. On the other side are all other men. And these others are all bad.

12. For the Rabbinic customs implied see Additional Note 12. *κτῶμαι*, 'of all I receive,' not 'possess.'

13. The tax-collector does not venture to look heavenwards: he assumes the attitude of a suppliant worthy of punishment.

14. δεδικαιωμένος. In what sense is this word used? Either: (1) in a Pauline sense, meaning justified by God's grace which is obtained by repentant humility—so J. Weiss and others; or (2) the

word simply means 'in the right,' and answers the question: which man had prayed in the right way? God decides that the right prayer had been prayed by the tax-collector. It is a sort of unconscious law-suit. God decides in favour of the tax-collector. His humility and repentance are accepted, the pride and self-righteousness of the Pharisee are rejected. Such 'thanks' as the Pharisee renders in 11 are in themselves evil. Loisy's view is much the same. He says: 'Jesus solemnly declares that of these two men who return home after their prayers, the tax-collector goes away more "justified" than the Pharisee. The words of the Saviour are not to be interpreted according to a dogmatic theory of Justification. It is not determined in what degree the Pharisee is inferior to the tax-collector, and the parable does not attribute to the Pharisee a certain incomplete righteousness, obtained by the works of the Law; it refrains from confounding him with the sinners enumerated by him, but it gives us to understand that he does not possess the righteousness which pleases God, and which gives access to the Kingdom of heaven. The conclusion appears to mean that the one of the two who has prayed well, and of whose prayer God has taken account, is not the Pharisee, but the tax-collector, and there is no question, at least directly, of sins remitted to the one and imputed to the other' (*E. S.* II. p. 192). The last half of the verse is out of place, for neither party is either 'humiliated' or 'exalted.' But of course the meaning is that in the world to come it will be shown that the tax-collector is 'justified,' for he will be exalted and in heaven, while the Pharisee will be in hell. The moral of the story is simply that humility is always more pleasing to God than confidence in one's own merits. The contrite tax-collector is nearer to God than the self-satisfied Pharisee.

No parable in the Gospels is more characteristic than this. None reflects better an essential feature of the teaching of Jesus. A legal religion has its dangers. However unjust Paul was to its merits, it has the defects of its qualities. A 'faith' one-sidedness has its dangers; a 'works' one-sidedness has its dangers too. And what they are is inimitably hit off in this admirable story. It touches the spot; it reveals the sore place. It is true.

For Rabbinic parallels see Additional Note 57.

15–17. JESUS AND THE CHILDREN

(*Cp.* Mark x. 13–16; Matt. xix. 13–15)

15 And they brought unto him also some infants, so that he might touch them: but when his disciples saw it, they rebuked them.

16 But Jesus called the infants unto him, and said, 'Let the little

children come unto me, and prevent them not: for of such is the
17 kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whoever shall not receive
the kingdom of God as a little child, shall surely not enter therein.'

After his big insertion of over eight chapters (351 verses) Luke now at last returns to Mark. His last section from Mark had been ix. 46–50 = Mark ix. 33–40. He omits Mark x. 1–12, the essence of which he has already given in the single verse xvi. 18.

15. For *παιδία*, 'children,' Luke has *βρέφη*, 'infants,' 'babies.'

18–30. THE DANGER OF RICHES

(*Cp.* Mark x. 17–31; Matt. xix. 16–30)

18 And a certain ruler asked him, saying, 'Good Master, what
19 must I do to inherit eternal life?' And Jesus said unto him,
20 'Why callest thou me good? none is good, except God alone. Thou
knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not
murder, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honour thy father
21 and thy mother.' And he said, 'All these have I observed from
22 my youth up.' And Jesus heard, and said unto him, 'Yet one
thing thou lackest: sell all that thou hast, and distribute it unto
the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come,
23 follow me.' And when he heard that, he was very sorrowful: for
he was very rich.

24 And when Jesus saw him, he said, 'How hard it is for them
25 that have riches to enter into the kingdom of God! For it is
easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man
26 to enter the kingdom of God.' And they that heard him said, 'Who
27 then can be saved?' And he said, 'What is impossible for men is
28 possible for God.' Then Peter said, 'Lo, *we* have abandoned our
29 possessions and followed thee.' And he said unto them, 'Verily I
say unto you, There is no man that hath abandoned house, or wife,
or brothers, or parents, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake,
30 who shall not receive back many times more in this age, and in
the world to come life everlasting.'

18. The questioner, in Matthew a young man, is in Luke a ruler.

19. It is to be noted that Luke, unlike Matthew, faithfully transcribes Mark x. 18.

27. Luke generalizes finely.

29. The addition of the 'wife' in Luke is to be noted. See Mark x. 29.

31–34. Renewed Prediction of Suffering and Death and Resurrection

(*Cp.* Mark x. 32–34; Matt. xx. 17–19)

31 Then he took the Twelve aside, and said unto them, 'Behold,
we go up to Jerusalem, and all that hath been written by the
32 prophets about the Son of man shall be accomplished. For he
will be given up to the heathen, and will be mocked, and ill treated,
33 and spat upon; and they will scourge him, and put him to death:
34 and on the third day he will rise again.' And they understood
none of these words; and this saying was hid from them, neither
knew they what was said.

Verse 34 is a close parallel to ix. 45. The prediction of the Passion is the fourth in Luke. *Cp.* ix. 22, 44, xvii. 25. There are peculiarities in 31 *b* and in 34 which do not appear in the parallels in Mark and Matthew. These special features make B. Weiss scent the presence of his source L, but this is by no means certain. The ascription of non-comprehension to the disciples is the more peculiar in view of the repetition of the announcement for the fourth time. It is, however, repeated from ix. 45, where it depends on Mark ix. 32. Loisy suggests that the constant repetitions of the prediction of the Passion may be explained upon the hypothesis that the narrative in Mark is founded upon a source in which 'l'éventualité de la mort était seulement indiquée, et où l'espoir du prochain triomphe restait au premier plan.' The present narrative in Mark, used by Matthew and Luke, may have been obtained by the systematic addition of more explicit statements concerning the Passion and the resurrection. The object of these additions was that Jesus might not seem to have been deceived by the *dénouement* of his career, so that the Gospel narrative might correspond better with the ordinary theme of Pauline teaching, 'et pour que l'insuffisance de la tradition représentée par les apôtres Galiléens fût en même temps dénoncée, autant qu'elle pouvait l'être, et dûment corrigée' (*E. S.* II. p. 233).

35–43. Healing of Bartimæus

(*Cp.* Mark x. 46–52; Matt. xx. 29–34, ix. 27–31)

35 And it came to pass, that as he drew near to Jericho, a blind
36 man sat by the way side begging: and hearing a crowd passing
37 by, he asked what this might be. And they told him that Jesus
38 of Nazareth was coming by. And he cried out, saying, 'Jesus,
39 son of David, have pity upon me.' And they who were in front
rebuked him, that he should hold his peace: but he kept on
40 crying all the louder, 'Son of David, have pity upon me.' And
Jesus stood still, and commanded him to be brought unto him:
41 and when he had come near, he asked him, 'What wouldst thou
that I should do unto thee?' And he said, 'Lord, I would that I
42 might see again.' And Jesus said unto him, 'See again: thy faith
43 hath saved thee.' And immediately he saw again, and he followed
him, glorifying God: and all the people, when they saw it, gave
praise unto God.

In Luke, too, Jesus passes through Jericho, although, says W., only the route from Galilee *via* Peræa, and not that *via* Samaria, led through Jericho. But this geographical dictum of W.'s is disputed. According to Spitta, Luke is perfectly accurate. It will be noticed that the healing of Bartimæus is in Luke placed before the entry into Jericho, whereas in Mark and Matthew it happens on the way out. There is no need to assume a separate source (L) for 35 and 43*b* to account for this. (So B. Weiss.) It is simpler to suppose that the object of the transposition is to explain the presence of the crowd in Jericho and to make the entry into the city more imposing (*E. S.* II. p. 248). As for 43*b* it is made up on the lines of vii. 16, ix. 43.

CHAPTER XIX

1–10. ZACCHÆUS THE TAX-COLLECTOR

(Luke only)

1, 2 And Jesus entered and passed through Jericho. And, behold,
there was a man named Zacchæus, who was the chief tax-collector
3 and rich. And he sought to see who Jesus was; and he could not
4 because of the crowd, for he was little of stature. And he ran in
front, and climbed up on to a sycomore tree to see him: for he
5 was about to pass that way. And when Jesus came to the place,
he looked up, and saw him, and said unto him, 'Zacchæus, make
6 haste to come down; for to-day I must stay at thy house.' And
7 he made haste to come down, and received him joyfully. And
when they saw it, they all murmured, saying, 'He has gone in to
8 lodge with a sinner.' And Zacchæus stood, and said unto the Lord;
'Behold, Lord, the half of my possessions I give to the poor; and
if I have wrongfully exacted ought from any man, I restore it to
9 him fourfold.' And Jesus said unto him, 'This day hath salvation
10 come to this house, seeing that he also is a son of Abraham. For
the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.'

The story of Zacchæus may have some traditional basis or it may be the creation of the Evangelist. It bears, as Loisy says, the mark of Luke, and the lesson to be drawn from it is analogous to the lessons of the rich man, the Pharisee, and the unjust steward. It is also a sort of double to the story of Levi (v. 27–32). It has the same general character as the story of the ten lepers, and of the woman healed on the Sabbath; 'récit symbolique et sans originalité, procédant de la rédaction plus que de la tradition évangélique' (*E. S.* I. p. 159). B. Weiss assigns the story to L, except verse 7, which is an insertion by Luke, breaking the connection, from Mark ii. 16. He sees the marks of L in Jesus being called *κύριος*, and in the assertion that Zacchæus has a first claim upon the salvation which is brought by the Messiah, both because he is a descendant of Abraham and because he has been a great sinner (*Quellen*, A, p. 208).

4. Was the tree inside the city? Perhaps we may suppose a tree in the courtyard or garden of a house.

5. Jesus perceives that a moral cure is here achievable by his own special methods. Zacchæus, by the interest he has shown in Jesus and by his anxiety to see him, will be susceptible to his influence. Instead of denouncing the sinner, Jesus asks his service, and the desired result is achieved. We need not suppose that Jesus knows his name by divine intuition. We may assume that Jesus has been told who the little man in the tree is, that he is a rich tax-collector, perhaps noted for his oppression and his spoils. Loisy, on the other hand, thinks that it is much more probable that we are to understand that Jesus knew the name and character of Zacchæus by divine inspiration.

8. 'I give,' *i.e.* I will give. He promises to give away half his possessions to the poor and to restore fourfold for past oppressions. He regards his wealth as the product of theft, and applies the law of Exodus xxii. 1.

9. *πρὸς αὐτόν.* Can this mean 'in regard to him'? So Loisy, who also translates xviii. 9 'in respect of those who trusted,' not 'to those who trusted.' Plummer holds that in both cases *πρὸς αὐτόν* means, as often in Luke, 'to him.'

Is Zacchæus supposed to be a Jew? Some think 'yes,' and would hold that Jesus is meant to say that Zacchæus has been saved just because he is a Jew, for it is to the lost sheep of the house of Israel that he (Jesus) has been sent. (So W.) In that case the story could hardly be Luke's creation. The wording seems to point to this conclusion. Plummer thinks there is no doubt about the matter. Seeing that he too is a son of Abraham, 'his detested calling has not cancelled his birthright.' Some, on the other hand, hold that the words in 9 mean that Zacchæus by his faith and repentance has shown himself a true son of Abraham in the spirit. Loisy supposes that no certain answer can be given. But it is at least probable that Luke was thinking of the salvation of the Gentiles when he told this tale of Zacchæus. 'Taking into account the spirit in which the Evangelist writes, everything leads one to believe that Zacchæus and his house represent the Gentiles to whom salvation comes, and that this new son of Abraham is a counterpart of the daughter of

Abraham, of whom Luke has spoken above (xiii. 16), and who, as representative of believing Israel, has been healed in the synagogue. If Jesus uses words about Zacchæus analogous to those which he used with regard to Levi, it is because the Evangelist does not wish to destroy the perspective of the story: but by "that which is lost" he means the Gentiles much more than "the lost sheep of the house of Israel"' (*E. S.* II. p. 257).

'To this house' has salvation come. Does this imply that his 'conversion' was accompanied by the 'conversion' of his family, or is it merely an alternative for Zacchæus as head and representative of his household? Probably the latter.

The good convert, once in 'the Church,' shows his zeal by giving half his property to the poor. For that reason perhaps it is not said, or thought necessary, that he should abandon all and follow Jesus.

10. The noble utterance is based upon Ezekiel xxxiv. 16. *Cp.* the note on ix. 55.

11–27. THE PARABLE OF THE TALENTS

(*Cp.* Matt. xxv. 14–30)

11 And as they hearkened to these words, he went on and spoke
a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they
12 thought that the kingdom of God would appear at once. So he
said: 'A certain noble journeyed to a far country to receive for
13 himself a kingdom, and then to return. And he called his ten
servants, and gave to them ten pounds, and said unto them, Trade
14 therewith till I return. But his fellow citizens hated him, and
sent an embassy after him, saying, We do not wish this man to
15 reign over us. And it came to pass, that when he had returned,
having received the kingdom, he bade those servants to be called
unto him, to whom he had given the money, that he might know
16 how much each man had gained by trading. Then came the first,
17 saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained ten pounds more. And he
said unto him, Excellent, thou good servant: because thou hast
been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities.
18 And the second came, saying, Lord, thy pound hath made five
19 pounds. And he said likewise to him, Be thou also over five
20 cities. And another came, saying, Lord, behold thy pound, which

21 I have kept laid away in a napkin: for I feared thee, because
thou art an hard man: thou takest what thou hast not deposited,
22 and reapest what thou hast not sown. And he said unto him,
Out of thine own mouth I condemn thee, thou wicked servant.
Thou knewest that I was an hard man, taking what I have not
23 deposited, and reaping what I have not sown: why then didst
thou not put my money into the bank, that at my return I might
24 have got it back with interest? And he said unto them that
stood by, Take away from him the pound, and give it to him that
25 hath the ten pounds. (And they said unto him, He has ten
26 pounds already.) For I say unto you, Unto every one who hath
shall be given; but from him that hath not shall be taken away
27 even that which he hath. But as for those mine enemies, who
did not wish me to reign over them, bring them hither, and slay
them before me.'

Luke inserts the tale of *Zacchæus* and the parable of the talents between Mark x. 52 and xi. 1. He has either recast the parable to give it, as it were, two applications and morals instead of only one (so Holtzmann), or (so W.) he has combined with the main parable of the talents fragments of another parable with a different purport. Loisy thinks that Luke had another redaction of the parable before him. His principal variants were already in his source. Thus he agrees with B. Weiss for whom this source is L, though Weiss holds that Luke combined pieces of Q with a groundwork of L.

The parable of the talents, as arranged by Matthew, was intended to press upon the disciples the duty of using the interval before the Advent to the best purpose. For the Advent is not to come at once, as was erroneously supposed when Jesus entered Jerusalem. (In other words, many years have elapsed since the death of Jesus, and there is still no prospect of the desired coming.) And in Luke, too, a main purpose of the parable is to combat the idea alluded to in 11 (peculiar to Luke) that the Kingdom was at once to be established in Jerusalem. Much lies between the arrival in Jerusalem, and the coming of the Kingdom. The old historic tradition, still recognizable in Mark, though corrected even there, that Jesus came to Jerusalem to establish the Kingdom, had to be 'contradicted and effaced by Luke to satisfy the exigencies of faith' (Loisy). Jerusalem has fallen: the Jews have been punished: but the End was not yet. But the framework of the first parable, or the fragment of the other parable, has a different purpose. Jesus has gone to heaven, where he will be invested with the Kingdom by God. The Jews do not want to recognize the Risen One as their king. Therefore, when he returns as king to inaugurate his kingdom, he will slay them all. This part of the parable is one of the most glaring of the New Testament contrasts to Matt. v. 44. Perhaps, following B. Weiss, we may connect this part of the parable with verse 11. Jesus did not go to Jerusalem to set up his kingdom; he has first to die and rise and go to heaven, and then only when he returns, and after the Judgment, shall the true Kingdom come (*Quellen*, A, p. 270).

11. Luke only. It is probable enough that this opinion was held: it is not certain that Jesus did not share it. To whom is Jesus speaking? His last words were spoken inside the house of Zacchæus. He now adds a parable. We may perhaps assume that Luke has the disciples in view. The object of the parable to Luke is to refute or explain a difficulty of the first Christian generations; if Luke does not name the disciples, this may be 'par une sorte de ménagement à leur égard' (*E. S.* II. p. 466).

12. The 'man' of Matthew has become a prince, who goes to seek the gift, or its confirmation, from the hands of the superior power, of a satrapy or kingdom. Thus did Archelaus and Antipas with many others journey to Rome (Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVII. 11, 1–4; XVIII. 5, 1). Some critics hold that Josephus was known to Luke, and that this gives us a hint as to his date. The prince in Luke is Jesus, high born indeed, son of David and son of God, who by his death went to heaven to receive the investiture of the Messianic Kingdom.

13. Luke makes them all receive the same sum, and that a smaller one. It would have been more in keeping with the 'prince' if Luke had changed the minæ into talents, as Matthew has done. That all the servants receive the same sum means, according to Loisy, that the mina represents 'la grâce du christianisme' which is the same for all.

'Till I return': that is, till the Parousia. 'Christ's manifestation in glory remains the true *coming*; it is not a mere returning' (Loisy).

14. The citizens protest, just as the Jews did in the case of Archelaus, but in vain. The meaning is that the Jews disbelieved in Jesus and resisted him.

17. The reward is proportionate to the increase made by each, as well as to the position of the giver, who, as a king, has

cities to dispose of. The meaning is that the specially good Christian will be associated with Jesus in his royal rule. He will govern a province of the new Israel in the Kingdom of God (*E. S.* II. p. 472).

25. This verse seems an unnecessary and interrupting interpolation. The verse is wanting in the S.S. Loisy thinks that this ejaculation of the bystanders was put in by Luke to give a better justification for Jesus himself solemnly to lay down, in the next verse, his principle of retribution.

27. This verse, like Matt. xxiv. 30, stands outside, and is superadded to, the parable. The fall of Jerusalem is alluded to and its accompanying slaughter of the Jews.

28–40. THE ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM

(*Cp.* Mark xi. 1–11; Matt. xxi. 1–11)

28 And when he had thus spoken, he journeyed forward, on his way
29 up to Jerusalem. And it came to pass, when he had come nigh
to Bethphage and Bethany, at the so-called mount of Olives, he
30 sent two of his disciples, saying, 'Go to the village before you; in
which as ye enter it ye will find an ass's colt tied, whereon no
31 man has yet sat: loose it, and bring it hither. And if any man
ask you, Why do ye loose it? thus shall ye say, The Lord has
need of it.'

32 And they that were sent went their way, and found even as
33 he had said unto them. And as they were loosing the colt, its
34 owners said unto them, 'Why loose ye the colt?' And they said,
'The Lord has need of it.'

35 And they brought it to Jesus: and they threw their garments
36 upon the colt, and they mounted Jesus upon it. And as he went,
37 they spread their clothes upon the way. And when he had come
near to the descent of the mount of Olives, the whole band of the
disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all
38 the miracles that they had seen, saying, 'Blessed in the name of
the Lord be the king that cometh: peace in heaven, and glory in
the heights.'

39 And some of the Pharisees from among the crowd said unto
40 him, 'Master, rebuke thy disciples.' And he answered and said

unto them, 'I tell you that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would cry out.'

37. Only Luke mentions that the enthusiasm of the crowd (who with him are turned into the mass (πλῆθος) of the disciples) was caused by Jesus's miracles. Loisy thinks that Luke wants to attenuate the Messianic character of the ovation. Jesus was the Messiah, but he was not thinking of inaugurating straightway the Messianic Kingdom. *Cp.* the parable of the talents.

38. The readings of the various MSS. vary slightly. The king is Jesus. *Cp.* ii. 14. 'Peace in heaven and glory in the heights.' 'Glory in the heights' perhaps means, 'may God be honoured and glorified in heaven (by the angels),' or 'God is glorified in heaven (by the angels) because he has sent the Messianic king upon earth.' 'Peace in heaven' goes back to Job xxv. 2. It is not easy to give to it any precise meaning. The interpretation suggested by B. Weiss, 'dass im Himmel Heil durch den Messias dem Volke bereitet ist,' seems strained.

39, 40. Luke only. The S.S. omits 'of the Pharisees': a sensible omission. It is odd that J. Weiss should say of the words in 40 that they are 'unerfindbar echt.' What test or criterion for such positiveness has he? Merely his own opinion. 'The stones would cry out.' Jesus means that the expressions of the crowd are wholly true and providentially ordained. Silence was impossible. Loisy is inclined to think that 39 and 40 are an adaptation and transposition of Matt. xxi. 15, 16, which is in its turn the creation of the first Evangelist. In that case the verses would be a later addition to the Gospel. Or both Matthew and Luke may depend on some traditional story, which each manipulates in a different way. Naturally B. Weiss assigns both 39, 40 and 41-44 to L.

If Jesus did not want to be regarded as king in the ordinary Jewish sense of the word as applied to the Messiah, if he wanted merely to be a spiritual king, or the servant of Isaiah xlii. and liii., it must be admitted that he positively courted misunderstanding. If the story we have just heard is based upon fact, he allows the crowd to call him king, and he enters Jerusalem in a manner deliberately intended to fulfil an ordinary, 'political,' Messianic prophecy. It seems inconceivable, if Luke xix. 28-40 be based upon fact, that Jesus did not believe himself to be the regular conventional Messianic king, who was about to set up his permanent Messianic kingdom.

41–44. Prediction of the Fall of Jerusalem

(Luke only)

41 And as he came near, he beheld the city, and wept over it,
42 saying, 'If thou too, yea even on this thy day, hadst known what
would lead to thy peace—but now it hath been hid from thine
43 eyes. For days will come upon thee, when thine enemies will
throw up an entrenchment against thee, and surround thee, and
44 hem thee in on every side, and they will raze thee to the ground,
and thy children within thee; and they will not leave in thee one
stone upon another; because they knewest not the time of thy
visitation.'

A *post-eventum* prophecy. The contrast between the cry for vengeance in xviii. 7 *seq.* and xix. 27 and the sincere grief over the city's fall is striking. W. thinks that it is connected with differences of date. The vengeance cry reflects the situation before the fall; the lament, the situation after it. Holtzmann, and following him, Loisy, think that the passage has been substituted by Luke for the story of the fig tree. The tears and the words bear the personal mark of Luke; in tone they resemble what Jesus says to the women in Jerusalem as he goes to be crucified. They are based on O.T. reminiscences. *Cp.* 2 Kings viii. 11, 12; Isaiah xxix. 3, 4.

42. 'The day' is the day on which he enters the city. The sentence is incomplete and broken off. One must understand, 'hadst thou realized, it would have been well with thee.' The tenses seem to show that the verse was written after the doom had fallen.

43. There is a zeugma. The verb *ἐδαφιοῦσιν*, 'cast to the ground,' can be used of a city, of a wall and houses, but not of people.

44. 'The time of thy visitation': visitation is here used in a neutral sense. God visits or tests Jerusalem in sending it the Messiah to see whether it will accept him or no.

45–48. The Cleansing of the Temple

(*Cp.* Mark xi. 15–19; Matt. xxi. 12, 13)

45 And he went into the temple, and began to drive out them
46 that sold therein, saying unto them, 'It is written, My house shall
be a house of prayer: but ye have made it a den of thieves.'

47 And he taught daily in the temple. But the chief priests and the scribes and the chiefs of the people sought to destroy him.
48 And they could not find out what they should do: for the people all hung upon his lips.

As in Matthew, Jesus proceeds from the Mount of Olives direct to the Temple. There he teaches daily, and apparently continues to do so for some time. Perhaps in addition to Mark, Luke knew a source in which there was no fig tree story.

48. The Revised Version renders: 'the people all hung upon him, listening.' W. denies that the words mean this, and renders 'all the people were eager to hear him.' It is noteworthy that Luke presses the popularity of Jesus in Jerusalem. So too in xxi. 38. But it is more noteworthy still, as B. Weiss points out (ascribing it not to Luke, but to L), that the people are supposed to be sympathetic and repentant as regards the death. A large number follow him to the place of execution and not apparently from mere idle curiosity (xxiii. 27; *Quellen*, B, p. 162). They look on at the crucifixion (xxiii. 35). And when Jesus has died the crowds disperse 'beating their breasts and repentant.' It is true that we have the scene with Barabbas, but B. Weiss thinks that for this, as for the extra words 'and the people' in xxiii. 14, L is not responsible. B. Weiss's arguments are certainly very striking, and extremely interesting here (*Quellen*, B, pp. 159, 183).

Pfleiderer presses the distinction between Mark and Luke. In Mark it is the cleansing of the Temple which provokes the ire of the Jewish authorities; not the *words* of Jesus, but his *deeds*. Luke sought to diminish and soften anything which looked like violence or as an attack upon established order and custom. It is therefore the teaching of Jesus which is objected to; the revolutionary deed is not indeed suppressed, but it is given a less conspicuous place (*Urchristentum*, I. p. 458). B. Weiss's explanation is, of course, quite different. For him 45 and 46 are an interpolation from Mark by Luke into the narrative of L. Verse 47 (in a shortened form, namely, 'And he taught daily in the temple. And the chiefs of the people could not find out what to do, for the people all hung upon his lips') follows after 44.

CHAPTER XX

1–8. The Authority of Jesus and of John

(*Cp.* Mark xi. 27–33; Matt. xxi. 23–27)

1 And it came to pass one day as he was teaching the people in
the temple, and proclaiming the good tidings, that the chief
2 priests and the scribes came up to him with the Elders, and spoke
unto him, saying, 'Tell us, by what authority doest thou these
3 things? or who is it that gave thee this authority?' And he
answered and said unto them, 'I will also ask you one question;
4 and answer me: the baptism of John, was it from heaven, or from
5 men?' And they reasoned with themselves, saying, 'If we say,
From heaven; he will say, Why then did ye not believe him?
6 but if we say, From men; all the people will stone us: for they
7 are convinced that John was a prophet.' And they answered that
8 they knew not whence it was. And Jesus said unto them, 'Neither
tell I you by what authority I do these things.'

1. In Mark there is only a day's interval between the purification of the Temple and this scene. Here the interval is longer. 'The things thou doest' in Mark refers to the purification. Here, rather awkwardly, it must rather refer to the teaching of Jesus, to his declaration of the good tidings (εὐαγγελιζομένου). For the rest Luke follows Mark closely.

9–19. The Parable of the Vineyard

(*Cp.* Mark xii. 1–12; Matt. xxi. 33–46)

9 Then began he to speak to the people this parable; 'A man
planted a vineyard, and let it to husbandmen, and went abroad
10 for some time. And at the due season he sent a servant to the

husbandmen, that they should give him of the fruit of the
vineyard: but the husbandmen beat him, and sent him away
11 empty. And again he sent another servant: and they beat him
12 also, and abused him, and sent him away empty. And again he
13 sent a third: and they wounded him also, and cast him out. Then
said the lord of the vineyard, What shall I do? I will send my
14 beloved son: perhaps they will have respect for him. But when
the husbandmen saw him, they considered among themselves,
saying, This is the heir: come, let us kill him, that the inheritance
15 may be ours. So they cast him out of the vineyard, and killed
him. What, then, will the lord of the vineyard do unto them?
16 He will come and destroy these husbandmen, and give the
vineyard to others.'

17 And when they heard it, they said, 'God forbid.' And he
looked at them, and said, 'What, then, is this which is written,
The stone which the builders rejected is become the corner stone?
18 Whoever shall fall upon that stone shall be broken in pieces; and
on whomsoever it shall fall, it will crush him to dust.'

19 And the chief priests and the scribes sought that very hour to
lay hands on him; but they feared the people: for they realised
that he had spoken this parable against them.

12. The three servants represent the prophets.

15. Luke aptly reserves the death treatment for the son.

16. What does 'Be it not so,' or 'God forbid' (μὴ γένοιτο) mean here? B. Weiss says that the audience censures the conduct of the husbandmen. The words can only mean: may such a thing never happen. This seems unlikely, for 'may it not be so' can surely only refer to the punishment in 16, and not to the conduct of the husbandmen. It would rather seem that the Scribes are meant to realize already the meaning of the parable. Therefore they say: may such a thing never happen, *i.e.* that God should kill the Jews and give their land to others. In this verse we have one more example how Jesus hopes and expects that God will treat his enemies.

18. This verse seems to be a quotation from an unknown source. It may, however, as Loisy thinks, be made up of biblical reminiscences such as Isaiah viii. 14, 15, xxviii. 13; Daniel ii. 35.

λικμάω must here apparently mean 'crush.'

20–26. 'GIVE UNTO CÆSAR'

(*Cp.* Mark xii. 13–17; Matt. xxii. 15–22)

20 So they watched, and sent forth spies, who feigned to be
righteous men, that they might catch him by a word, so as to
21 give him up to the rule and authority of the governor. And they
asked him, saying, 'Master, we know that thou sayest and teachest
straightforwardly, neither dost thou respect the person of anyone,
22 but thou teachest the way of God truly: Is it lawful for us to
23 give tribute unto the Emperor, or no?' But he perceived their
24 craftiness, and said unto them, 'Why tempt ye me? Shew me
a silver coin. Whose image and superscription has it?' They
25 answered and said, 'The Emperor's.' And he said unto them,
'Pay then to the Emperor what is the Emperor's and to God
26 what is God's.' And they could not catch him by a word before
the people: and they marvelled at his answer, and held their
peace.

20. *ἐνκαθέτους ὑποκρινομένους ἑαυτοὺς δικαίους εἶναι.* Dr Weymouth renders: 'They sent spies who were to act the part of good and honest men.' The spies had to pretend to be such eager observers of the Law that the tribute question caused them conscientious scruples. This verse of introduction is mostly peculiar to Luke. It affords B. Weiss a very ingenious argument for a theory that the story in Luke is taken not from Mark, but from L.

27–40. THE LIFE OF THE RESURRECTION

(*Cp.* Mark xii. 18–27; Matt. xxii. 23–33)

27 Then came to him some of the Sadducees, who deny that there
28 is a resurrection; and they asked him, saying, 'Master, Moses
wrote for us, If a man die, having a wife, but no child, his brother
29 must marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. Now
there were seven brothers: and the first took a wife, and died
30, 31 without children. And the second and the third took her to wife,
and so too all the seven: and they left no children, and died.
32, 33 Last of all the woman died also. So in the resurrection whose
wife of them is she? for the seven had her to wife.'

34 And Jesus answered and said unto them, 'The children of this

35 world marry, and are given in marriage: but they who have been
accounted worthy to obtain *that* world and the resurrection of the
36 dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage. For they cannot
die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the
37 sons of God, being the sons of the resurrection. Now that the
dead are raised, Moses also hath indicated in the story of the
Bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham and the God
38 of Isaac and the God of Jacob. But he is not a God of the dead,
39 but of the living: for all live unto him.' Then some of the scribes
40 answered and said, 'Master, thou hast spoken excellently.' For
they no longer dared to ask him any other question.

34. The verse is peculiar to Luke. In this world men marry to continue the race and supply the place of the dead. In the next world there is no death; so there is no need of marriage. The S.S. reads: 'do not bear or beget,' which Merx thinks is more original.

Spitta holds that Luke has here preserved best the version of the 'apostolische Grundschrift.' Mark xii. 26, 27 is a kind of appendix to the Sadducean question, in which a proof of the Resurrection is given. This appendix is prepared for in 24. Note πλανᾶσθε both in 24 and 27, and τὰς γραφάς in 24 with ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ Μωϋσέως of 26. Moreover these very verses show the influence of Paul. *Cp.* 1 Cor. xv. 4, 33, and 1 Cor. vi. 14. The 'Grundschrift' closed the section with 36. Verses 37, 38 have been added into Luke from Mark. The last four words of 38 simply show that the interpolator knew whence Mark had got the idea of his xii. 26, 27. For these verses, and not merely Luke xx. 38, depend upon 4 Macc. vii. 19 and xvi. 25. The interpolator in Luke simply added a little more, or 'hat wenigstens in Markus xii. 26, 27 eine Anspielung auf jene Makkabäerstellen gefunden.' *Cp.* the note on verse 38 below. Either hypothesis seems to me a little dubious. Nor can I think that the opposition of the 'children of this world' and 'they who are held worthy to receive that world' is primitive. *Cp.* xvi. 8. It seems to me, like so many other things in Luke, to point forward to John (*Streitfragen*, pp. 155–158).

35. Luke or his source seems here to limit the Resurrection to the righteous. This is highly noteworthy (*cp.* xiv. 14).

36. 'Equal unto the angels' is equivalent to being 'sons of God'; the Syriac omits 'sons of God' (*cp.* Wisdom of Solomon v. 5). Moreover it reads 'neither marry nor are able to die,' which Merx

thinks better. That they do not marry is not, strictly speaking, proved by the fact that they cannot die. The γάρ is meaningless. But if they do not die, they *need* not marry. The ἔτι he regards as a dogmatic interpolation, directed against the theory (not, as he seems to think, universally held by Jews) that there was a second death after the Resurrection.

38. 'All live unto him' is, at first sight, very strange here. W. says simply: 'What these words in this connection were intended to mean I do not know.' J. Weiss interprets them by 'mit Gott in Verkehr stehen.' Holtzmann says they betray the author of Acts xvii. 28 and look back upon Romans xiv. 8. He also calls attention, as the source of much in these verses (37, 38), to the remarkable passages and parallels, 4 Maccabees vii. 19, xvi. 25. 'In the belief that, like our patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, they do not die to God, but live to God.' 'Knowing moreover this, that they who die for God's sake, live to God, like Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and all the patriarchs.' Loisy also admits the debt to 4 Maccabees; the meaning is, he says: the righteous dead, even before the Judgment, when the world holds them as dead, live to God, united, that is, with Him, and sharing His felicity. B. Weiss is interesting, if fanciful. He supposes that Luke's differences from Mark are due not to Luke, but to L. Luke incorporated into the Marcan story some sayings of L about marriage. To him especially are due 'the sons of this world' (or 'age'), 'they who have been accounted worthy to obtain that world' (or 'age'), and 'all live to him.' In that case, however, L becomes less of a mere reporter, for that 38 is due to the 4 Maccabees passages seems hardly disputable (*Quellen*, A, p. 238, B, p. 140). According to Weiss the object of the sayings in L was to show that marriage was only an institution for our present earth and life, and that its purpose was merely the procreation of children, which is unnecessary in the next world, where everybody, like the angels, is immortal. It embodied a view of marriage on rather depreciatory lines.

39. *Cp.* Mark xii. 28. In a detailed and highly ingenious argument Spitta, following his theory that Luke constantly preserves the order and wording of the oldest source (the 'apostolische Grundschrift') better than Mark, essays to show that 39 and 40 are not borrowed from Mark xii. 28, 34, but are the originals of these passages. On the other hand 39 and 40 did not originally stand where we find them now, but they stood after 44, for in the 'Grundschrift,' the Resurrection episode and the son of David episode formed one continuous section. The meaning of καλῶς,

'Master, thou hast spoken well,' has been misunderstood by Mark. He uses it in xii. 28 to express genuine admiration, whereas it really was intended to indicate a mere hypocritical assent on the part of the Sadducees, because they, like others, were nonplussed by the ability and cogency of Jesus's answers, and did not venture to ask him any more questions (*Streitfragen*, pp. 144–155).

40. *Cp.* Mark xii. 34.

41–44. Is the Messiah David's Son?

(*Cp.* Mark xii. 35–37; Matt. xxii. 41–46)

41 And he said unto them, 'How say they that the Messiah is
42 David's son? And David himself saith in the book of Psalms,
43 The Lord said unto my lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I
44 make thine enemies thy footstool. So David calleth him lord, how is he then his son?'

Luke's version is the shortest of the three. Spitta's views upon this passage are highly ingenious, but of doubtful validity. Nevertheless they are worth hearing, as every view is worth hearing which attempts to avoid and make unnecessary the apparently obvious interpretation of the passage, namely, that Jesus believed and implied that the Messiah was not in physical descent the son of David. For certainly such a supposition is strange, though it can be accounted for if Jesus came to believe that he was the Messiah, though he knew that he was not, or had no knowledge that he was, of Davidic descent. He then seeks to reconcile the two facts by denying the Davidic descent of the Messiah. But how then is it that we hear no word that his claim to the Messiahship was not at once silenced by the denial of his Davidic descent?

Spitta, then, holds that in 41–44 Jesus does not question the Davidic descent in the very least. He is still speaking to the Sadducees. 41 follows on 36 (37 and 38 were interpolated, 39 and 40 transposed). 41 *a*, 'He said unto them,' has been added to make a necessary fresh link. I suppose (though Spitta does not state this) that a γάρ (for) after the πῶς (how) would be required. The argument in 41–44 is strictly relative to 36 and to the question of the Sadducees. The difficulty which the Sadducees raise as to the woman in the Resurrection is parallel to a difficulty which might be raised about David and the Messiah. The Messiah is David's son, and yet David calls him his Lord? How are these two facts to be reconciled? Simply thus: As regards his descent, the Messiah is indeed David's son, but in the perfected Kingdom, at the Parousia, in the age of the Resurrection, in the æon to come, when—and not till when—the Messiah will sit at God's right hand, then the Messiah will be David's Lord. For then fleshly relationships disappear. David (like all the sons of the Resurrection) and the Messiah will both be God's sons, and it is just this general sonship which makes it possible that the Messiah can be David's Lord without any 'Kollision mit dem Abhängigkeitsverhältniss' to his father David. Thus we have in this oldest form of the story no advanced Christological conception; on the contrary. The divine sonship is here implied quite generally, just as in 36.

Spitta presses the omission of any subject to **λέγουσιν** in 41 which Loisy accounts for in a totally different way. Jesus says simply, 'what about the fact that the Messiah is David's son?' By the question, 'how do they say' (*i.e.* in what sense is it generally said). 'that the Messiah is David's son?' Jesus does not mean to imply that he does not share that opinion. Mark gives to **λέγουσιν** a definite subject, namely, the Scribes. He means to imply not indeed that in his opinion, or Jesus's, the Messiah was not David's son, but that this opinion of the schools needed at any rate correction, or explanation, or enlargement. The correction to him was that the Messiah was only *quâ* the flesh David's son, but that in true being he was God's Son,—God's Son in the special sense of Paul, in the sense of the 'christliche Dogmatik.' This is ingenious, but doubtful. The simple explanation of Loisy is that the Scribes have been omitted in Luke, because they are named in 39, and the question is directly addressed to them (*E. S.* II. p. 360; *Streitfragen*, pp. 158–167). But nevertheless Spitta's whole essay does give us pause before, on the basis of this one passage, we jump to the conclusion that Jesus did not regard himself or the Messiah as of Davidic descent.

45–47. AN ATTACK ON THE SCRIBES

(*Cp.* Mark xii. 38–40)

45 Then in the hearing of all the people he said unto his disciples,
46 'Beware of the scribes, who like to walk in long robes, and love salutations in the market-places, and the chief seats in the
47 synagogues, and the chief places at feasts; who devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: these shall receive all the heavier punishment.'

46. Mark xii. 38, 39. The substance had been already given in Luke xi. 43.

47. Mark xii. 40.

CHAPTER XXI

1–4. THE WIDOW'S MITE

(*Cp.* Mark xii. 41–44)

1 And he looked up, and saw some rich men throwing their gifts
2 into the treasury. And he saw also a certain poor widow throwing
3 in thither two farthings. And he said, 'Of a truth I say unto
4 you, that this poor widow hath thrown in more than they all: for
all these threw in from their superfluity unto the offerings: but
she from her poverty hath thrown in all the living that she had.'

Mark's version is closely followed with slight contractions and simplifications.

5–38. THE PAROUSIA, THE END AND ITS SIGNS

(*Cp.* Mark xiii.; Matt. xxiv.)

5 And as some spoke of the temple, how it was adorned with
6 beautiful stones and gifts, he said, 'As for these things which ye
behold, days will come, in which there shall not be left one stone
upon another, that shall not be thrown down.'

7 And they asked him, saying, 'Master, when, then, shall these
things be? and what is the sign when these things are about to
8 be fulfilled?' And he said, 'Take heed that ye be not led astray:
for many will come in my name, saying, It is I, and the time hath
9 drawn near: go ye not after them. But when ye shall hear of
wars and tumults, be not terrified: for these things must first
happen, but the End is not at once.'

10 Then said he unto them, 'Nation will rise against nation, and
11 kingdom against kingdom: and there will be great earthquakes

and famines, and pestilences in divers places; and fearful sights
12 and great signs will there be from heaven. But before all these,
they will lay their hands on you, and persecute you, giving you up
to the synagogues and prisons, and bringing you before kings and
13 rulers for my name's sake. And it will be to you an opportunity
14 for bearing witness. So resolve in your hearts not to practise
15 beforehand what ye shall answer: for I will give you a mouth and
wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to withstand
16 or gainsay. And ye will be given up even by parents, and
brothers, and kinsfolk, and friends; and some of you they will
17 put to death. And ye will be hated of all men for my name's
8, 19 sake. But not an hair of your head shall perish. Through your
endurance ye shall acquire your lives.

20 'But when ye see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then know
21 that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them who are
in Judæa flee to the mountains; and let them who are in the
midst of the city go forth; and let them that are in the country
22 enter not in. For these are days of vengeance, that all which
23 hath been written may be fulfilled. But woe unto them that are
with child, and to them that give suck, in those days; for there
will be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people.
24 And they will fall by the edge of the sword, and be led away
captive unto all the nations and Jerusalem will be trodden down
by the nations, until the times of the nations be fulfilled.

25 'And there will be signs in the sun and the moon and the
stars; and upon the earth panic of nations in their perplexity at
26 the roaring of the sea and the tossing of its waves; men dying
from fear and anxious expectation of the things which are coming
27 upon the earth: for the heavenly powers will be shaken. And
then they will see the Son of man coming on a cloud with power
28 and great glory. And when these things begin to come to pass,
then take heart and raise your heads; for your redemption
draweth nigh.'

29 And he spoke to them a parable; 'Behold the fig tree, and all
30 the trees. When they shoot forth, ye see and know of yourselves
31 that summer is now near. So too, when ye see these things come
to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is near.

32 'Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away

33 till all shall have taken place. Heaven and earth shall pass away:
but my words shall not pass away.

34 ‘And take heed to yourselves, that your hearts be not made
heavy by debauchery and drunkenness, and worldly cares, and
35 that day come not upon you suddenly as a snare. For come it
36 will upon all that dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch
then and pray always, that ye may have power to escape all these
things that are about to come to pass, and to stand before the Son
of man.’

37 And in the day time he used to teach in the temple; and at
night he went out, and abode in the mount that is called the
38 mount of Olives. And all the people came early in the morning
to him in the temple to listen to him.

Luke mainly follows Mark, but he makes many changes and additions of his own, to suit his modified point of view and later date. He had used the material of Q, which Matthew (in his chapter xxiv.) combines with Mark, by itself in chapter xvii.

5–7. *Cp.* Mark xiii. 1–4; Matt. xxiv. 1–3.

5. Apparently Luke desires the reader to believe that the apocalyptic oration was delivered within the Temple and publicly. *Cp.* 37, 38 (*E. S.* II. p. 395).

8–36. Luke now brings in most of the apocalyptic thirteenth chapter of Mark. He had given parallels to it from Q in chapter xvii.

8–11. *Cp.* Mark xiii. 5–8; Matt. xxiv. 4–8. Here we have prediction as in 25–27. Between, in 12–24 (indicated by the words ‘before these things’ in 12), we get an account of the past in a thinly veiled predictive form.

8. ‘In my name.’ One has apparently to assume that some persons would claim to be the Christ reappearing on earth for the Judgment and the Kingdom. They will say: ‘It is I,’ *i.e.* ‘I am the man you are expecting.’ Note that in Luke’s day, to say, ‘the End is near’ is a mark of deception. Yet that is what Jesus said all his ministry. This is a marked difference of perspective from the primitive Gospel (Loisy).

9. Note πρῶτον and οὐκ εὐθέως. The End has not come though the wars are over. It was not intended by God that the End should come ‘at once’ after the wars.

12–19. *Cp.* Mark xiii. 9–13; Matt. xxiv. 9–14, x. 17–21.

12. 'Before all these.' For Luke now prophesies what had already happened or was happening. Mark implies that the persecutions and the wars and the earthquakes &c. shall happen together. Luke declares that the persecutions shall happen first.

13. 'It will be to you an opportunity for bearing witness.' Or we may translate: 'it will turn out unto you for a testimony,' that is, apparently—it will be an opportunity for you to proclaim and testify to the truth of the gospel. But J. Weiss supposes that it means: 'it will end for you in martyrdom.'

15. Luke is thinking of Stephen and of Paul (Loisy).

18. This perhaps means that your sufferings are all in the cognisance, and through the will, of God, or that your eternal life shall be secured, or (as both of these interpretations seem strained), that you shall not be injured unto death. Yet this third interpretation partially contradicts the end of 16.

19. Here again either eternal life is meant, or that they shall not be killed. J. Weiss thinks the contradiction between 16 and 18, 19 can only be met by supposing that the former refers to the Christians who have already died, the latter to the writer's contemporaries, who are encouraged and told that no harm shall come to them. Similarly Loisy. Those who have died are the exception. The majority shall, through their fidelity, survive uninjured and be saved by the coming of the Messiah in glory.

20–23. *Cp.* Mark xiii. 14–20; Matt. xxiv. 15–22.

24. Luke only. 'The times of the nations'—a regular apocalyptic sort of phrase. It refers to the appointed time for the rule of Rome.

The passage in Mark is modified to suit a later period. Jerusalem has fallen and is desolate. Its fall was not the beginning of the End. There is a fresh interval; only at its close will there be a judgment upon the heathen. Meanwhile the Jews have been punished for their unbelief. Luke does not exaggerate the awful calamities which befell them. J. Weiss supposes that the material of 20–23 is older than 70. Might it not be during the Roman War that the Christians were urged to leave Jerusalem? Eusebius says that such an oracle was given at this time.

25-28. *Cp.* Mark xiii. 24-27; Matt. xxiv. 19-31.

Luke now turns to the real future. The Messiah's coming will be long after the fall of Jerusalem. The Jews have been punished and slain already; the 'distress of the nations' (*συνοχὴ ἐθνῶν*) implies a punishment of the heathen, and effects the deliverance of the Christians. Their redemption is wrought, as W. points out, not by the death of Jesus, but by his reappearance (the Parousia). According to B. Weiss, verses 12-28, 34-36 are mainly taken from L.

27. The Christian Messiah is a divine being. The doctrine of the Messiah among the Jews tended towards the Christian era to become more mysterious; the figure became less earthly and more heavenly; less human and more divine. We can note this in the developments of the Son of man of Daniel vii., even if that strange figure be not there intended to denote the Messiah. In Ezra iv. and elsewhere, the Messiah is far removed from the king of Isaiah xi. Christian theology fastens upon these conceptions and expands them, whereas Jewish theology drops them, and returns emphatically, and for good, to the simpler and older conception in Isaiah xi. Thus, on the one side, the Messiah becomes God; on the other side, he becomes again a mere man.

29-31. *Cp.* Mark xiii. 28, 29; Matt. xxiv. 32, 33.

32, 33. *Cp.* Mark xiii. 30-32; Matt. xxiv. 34-36. Luke omits that only the Father knows the hour.

32. This assertion, repeated from Mark, does not seem to suit Luke, who implies a considerable interval before the final End. 'How he explained this prophecy to himself—whether there were, when he wrote, men of the first generation still living, or whether he applied the prediction to the men of his (*i.e.* the second or third) generation, we do not know' (J. Weiss).

34-36. Luke only (but *cp.* Mark xiii. 33-37).

35. The Judgment is over the whole world. The Parousia does not concern Palestine specially; it concerns all the inhabited earth. The snare and the drunkenness come from Isaiah xxiv. 17, 20 (Septuagint).

37, 38. *Cp.* Mark xi. 19; Matt. xxi. 17. Whereas in Mark Jesus sleeps at Bethany, in Luke he sleeps on the Mount of Olives. Note that it is implied that he taught in the Temple for many days. This seems to follow another tradition. *Cp.* xix. 47.

CHAPTER XXII

1, 2. The Decision of the Authorities

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 1, 2; Matt. xxvi. 1–5)

1 Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called
2 the Passover. And the chief priests and scribes sought how they
might kill him; for they feared the people.

1. Luke confuses together the opening 'Paschal' ceremony of the Lamb with the festival of the Unleavened Bread, much as modern Jews to-day use the term 'Passover' to include the two. He omits the special date: 'after two days.' And he omits: 'Not on the festival lest there be a disturbance.' The latter sentence he omitted because, according to the tradition which he followed, Jesus was killed on the festival, and therefore the contradiction seemed to him too apparent and awkward. Verse 2 is also reminiscent of Mark xi. 18. B. Weiss holds that verse 1 is from L.

3–6. The Betrayal

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 10, 11; Matt. xxvi. 14–16)

3 And Satan entered into Judas who was called Iscariot, and
4 was of the number of the Twelve. And he went, and conferred
with the chief priests and officers as to how he might deliver him
5 up unto them. And they were glad, and agreed to give him
6 money. And he promised, and kept seeking an opportunity to
deliver him up unto them, when the crowd should be absent.

3. As Mark xiv. 3–9 (from whatever cause) is omitted, Luke now comes to Mark xiv. 10. Judas's act is regarded as only explicable though the direct instigation of the devil (*cp.* John xiii. 2–27, xiv. 30) who now tempts Jesus for the last time (*cp.* iv. 13).

B. Weiss holds that most of 3–6 goes back to L, who had his own special narrative of the last days in Jerusalem, of the Passion, the death and the resurrection. Luke combines L's narrative with touches from Mark. In fact from xxii. 14 Luke in Weiss's opinion follows L almost 'exclusively,' only weaving in occasional reminiscences from Mark. That Luke has used another source over and above Mark for his narrative seems pretty sure. Loisy's view is somewhat divergent, but, I am inclined to think, less probable. For he holds that the special source from which Luke drew his description of the supper was one of the documents which Mark too had employed. 'Les paroles concernant le vin que Jésus ne doit plus boire avant l'avènement du royaume, et la querelle des disciples sur la première place dans le royaume, avec les déclarations qui s'y rapportent, sont des éléments traditionnels indépendants de Paul, antérieurs à Marc, et qu'il est tout naturel de rattacher à la source ou aux sources primitives, soit au recueil de sentences, soit au document qui a fourni à Marc l'esquisse historique de la vie de Jésus, si tant est que ces deux sources ne se confondent pas en une seule, ou qu'elles n'aient pas contenu toutes les deux les paroles prononcées par Jésus dans son dernier repas (*E. S.* II. p. 544).

4. Luke adds the *στρατηγοί*. They are the captains of the Temple guard.

6. The 'favourable opportunity' is explained to be one when no 'crowd' should be with him.

7–13. The Preparation for the Passover Meal

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 12–16; Matt. xxvi. 17–19)

7 Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover
8 had to be killed. And he sent Peter and John, saying, 'Go and
9 prepare for us the passover, that we may eat it.' And they said
10 unto him, 'Where wouldst thou that we prepare it?' And he
said unto them, 'Behold, when ye have entered into the city, a
man will meet you, bearing a pitcher of water; follow him into
11 the house in which he entereth. And ye shall say unto the owner
of the house, The Master saith unto thee, Where is the chamber,
12 where I may eat the passover with my disciples?' And he will
show you a large upper room furnished with couches; there

13 prepare it.' And they departed, and found as he had said unto
them: and they prepared the passover.

Mark is followed here fairly closely. The two disciples of Mark xiv. 13 are turned into Peter and John.

14-20. THE LAST SUPPER

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 22-25; Matt. xxvi. 26-29)

14 And when the hour had come, he sat down to table, and the
15 twelve apostles with him. And he said unto them, 'I have
earnestly desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer:
16 for I say unto you, I shall surely not eat it again until it be
fulfilled in the kingdom of God.'

17 And he took a cup, and spoke the blessing, and said, 'Take this,
18 and divide it among yourselves: for I say unto you, From henceforth I shall surely not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the
kingdom of God shall have come.'

19 And he took bread, and spoke the blessing, and broke it, and
gave it unto them, saying, 'This is my body which is given for
20 you: this do in remembrance of me.' Likewise also the cup after
supper, saying, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood, which
is shed for you.

The account of the Last Supper in Luke has many peculiarities. In Mark and Matthew the prediction of the betrayal precedes the celebration or institution of the special Last Supper rite; in Luke the prediction follows it, but without any separate introduction or pause. Luke emphasizes the view that the supper was the Paschal meal; hence verse 15, which is peculiar to him.

A fresh and highly ingenious view of verse 15 has been put forward by Mr Brooke and Prof. Burkitt (*Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1908, pp. 569-571). According to this view the meaning of 15 is, 'I have intensely desired to eat this approaching Passover with you, but I realize and am convinced that I shall not be able to do so. My next Passover will be the Messianic feast.' The words in that case were not spoken on the first night of the festival; they were uttered a little while before the festival; they may be authentic, and yet the Last Supper need not be the Passover meal. As the words stand, they seem to imply that 'this Passover' is the Passover, which was immediately at hand. It is obvious that the redactor, whether of the source or of Luke, so understood them. It is of course conceivable that they are an echo of a saying of Jesus in which he said something to the effect that he was keen to partake of the approaching Passover with his disciples, but that he felt he would not be able to do so. But such a hypothesis is purely conjectural.

In what sense is it meant that the Passover meal will have its fulfilment in the Kingdom of God? Some suppose that the redemption from Egypt is regarded as a type of the complete spiritual redemption which is to come with the Kingdom of God. Others suppose (*e.g.* Plummer) 'that the Passover of which Christ will partake, after having fulfilled the type, is the Christian Eucharist, in which He joins with the faithful in the Kingdom of God upon earth.' Holtzmann says that just as Jesus 'fulfils' the Law as a whole, so is the law of the Passover rite to be 'fulfilled' in the Kingdom by the transformation of the transitory type into a permanent form ('durch Verwandlung des vergänglichen Typus in dauernden Gehalt'). The MS. D has *βρωθῇ* for *πληρωθῇ*, which W. prefers. The last Passover meal is thus the 'Vorstufe zum Mahl im Reiche Gottes.' Other commentators give other varying explanations, upon which, for the special purpose of this book, it is unnecessary to enter.

There are three main views about Luke's narrative. The divergence rests partly upon the fact that the MS. D and some of the MSS. of the old Latin translation omit verse 20 and all the words in verse 19 *after* 'This is my body.'

(1) The first view accepts the longer text as it stands as the right text of Luke. In this view Luke sharply separates between the celebration of the old Passover rite and the celebration or institution of the new communion. 15–18 speak of the former; 19, 20 of the latter. Thus, in 15 and 16 Jesus tells of his desire to eat this final Passover with his disciples. He eats the unleavened bread. This is implied in 16. He drinks the Passover wine. This is implied in 17. Verses 15 and 16, as regards the eating, correspond exactly with 17 and 18 as regards the drinking.

In 17 we are still in the midst of the Passover celebration. To make the parallelism between the eating and drinking complete, Luke transposes Mark xiv. 25 to this place. Jesus will neither eat nor drink *of the Passover* again until the Kingdom has come.

The old rites are thus concluded. Now follows (in 19) the new rite, and Luke largely adopts the wording of Paul in 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25. The Paschal meal is over. To show this more definitely, Luke adds the words in 20, 'After the meal.'

In 19, in addition to 'This is my body,' which we find in

Mark, we have here the extra words 'which is given for you,' an adoption and expansion from Paul, who has 'which is for you.' The rite symbolizes the atoning sacrifice of Jesus through his death for the benefit of those who believe in him.

In 20, the wording includes all that Paul has—with the addition of 'which is poured out for you'—taken over from Mark, with 'you' substituted for 'many.' The grammar is at fault if the additional clause is made to qualify 'blood,' the sense if it is made to qualify 'cup.' Thus the total verse shows itself made up from Paul's words and Mark's.

Moreover by including in 19 Paul's words, 'This do in memory of me,' Luke clearly turns the special communion of the Last Supper into a liturgical and commemorative rite. Whether Jesus himself is supposed to have partaken of this special bread and cup is open to argument. Those who accept Luke's version, as we now have it in the ordinary text, can well argue that Jesus ate and drank no more after the Passover rites recorded in 16–18.

'The new covenant in my blood' means that through his death Jesus forms a new covenant between himself and all who believe or shall believe in him. The new covenant (Jeremiah xxxi. 31) like the old covenant (Exodus xxiv. 8) is sealed and effected by blood. The cup with its wine is the symbol of the new covenant wrought by the self-sacrifice of Jesus.

(2) The second view follows the reading of D. That is, it rejects all that part of verse 19 which comes after 'This is my body,' and the whole of 20. Into the evidence confirming this view outside the New Testament I cannot enter here.

The special rite or institution of the Last Supper is, according to this view, begun with 17. Verse 16 is merely introductory and general. There is no sharp separation between the Passover rites and the special Last Supper rites as in the first view.

Instead of the 'cup' following the 'bread,' the bread (19) follows the cup (*cp.* 1 Cor. x. 16). Moreover, the bread becomes the more important part of the whole function, and that in truth it was so there are several traces in the earliest nomenclature and traditions of the ceremony.

The cup is not combined with any reference to the blood of Jesus, and upon this fact J. Weiss lays much stress. The death of Jesus is alluded to, but not his sacrificial or atoning death. J. Weiss, unlike his father, B. Weiss, holds that Jesus drank of the cup. 'Inconceivable as this would be if Jesus had offered his blood as a sacrament to his disciples, the text of Luke assumes it as a matter of course. As Jesus eats the Passover, so he drinks from the cup.'

The shorter form of 19, according to D, assimilates it to

Mark xiv. 22. Here we have the more important part—the salient part—of the rite. And perhaps Jesus said as regards the bread, 'This is my body,' but not as regards the wine, 'This is my blood.' This is what J. Weiss thinks. Jesus did say, 'This is my body,' as he broke the bread. The symbolism intended by Jesus —'Behold my body'—was limited by him to the bread, and did not extend to the wine. It was intended to express the communion between Jesus and his disciples. They were knit to each other and to him, forming a mystic whole with him, themselves a part of him, by the communion rite, by eating, together with him, the bread which was to symbolize himself.

This second view is also held by some who do not share J. Weiss's opinions as to the 'cup,' or as to the intentions of the symbolism. It may be noted also that B. Weiss has a somewhat peculiar interpretation of 18. He regards its changes from Mark as significant. Mark had spoken of Jesus drinking a new wine in the Kingdom, which B. Weiss supposes to mean 'in heaven'; whereas here Jesus speaks of drinking wine when the Kingdom shall have come. This B. Weiss supposes to mean 'upon earth,' the change of wording being due to Judæo-Christian influences and to an environment in which the establishment of an earthly kingdom of glory was still expected. This conception, both of Mark xiv. 25 and of the significance of the little changes in Luke, seems to me very dubious.

(3) A third view has been put forward by W. It is bold, but very ingenious.

According to him the whole of 19 (as well as 20) must be rejected, and not merely the second half of it.

Luke's account of the supper identifies it with the Passover, and makes it purely historical. The liturgical *rite* is added on with words borrowed from Paul.

Thus 15 and 16 describe the Passover meal, but they also really *include* Mark xiv. 22. 'The assimilation of the "Passover meal" with the Last Supper causes the omission of the bread. In the place of the bread we have the Passover.' ('Durch diese Verschmelzung des Paschas mit dem Abendmahl wird die Auslassung des Brotes bedingt, an Stelle desselben tritt eben das Pascha, was deshalb nicht so ganz willkürlich ist, weil in der biblischen Sprache Brot essen allgemein für Speisen (auch anderer Gerichte) gesagt wird.')

Thus 16 corresponds with Mark xiv. 22, while 17, 18 corresponds with xiv. 23–25. At the end of 18 we have reached the same point as in Mark xiv. 25. The strong point of W.'s argument seems to be that he keeps the parallelism between 16 and 18. Both refer to the Last Supper rite, which is assimilated with the

Passover; whereas, in the second view, 16 refers exclusively to the Passover, and 18 refers to the special drinking of the special cup. Nevertheless, if Mark xiv. 22 is old and authentic, it seems most hard to believe that Luke would have suppressed it; 16 is a totally inadequate substitute for Mark xiv. 22. Are we to suppose that Jesus said neither 'This is my body' nor 'This is my blood,' and that this oldest and truest form of the tradition of what happened at the supper is alone preserved by Luke?

Obviously, if the rite is over in 18, the *whole* of 19 and 20 are additions. The *liturgical* rite, to be repeated after Jesus's death, must also, it was supposed, go back to the Master. Hence we get the insertion of 19 and 20 in the words of Paul. 19, as D has it, 'is a very unsatisfactory end; it is rather a troublesome addition (*ein lästiger Ueberhang*). It is really only the beginning of the new clause (19, 20); it seemed indispensable, because without it there would have been no mention of the bread, for in 15–18 the bread has not been mentioned. But this beginning, like its continuation, comes from 1 Cor. xi. 24.' 'Will man also konsequent sein, so muss man den ganzen zweiten Absatz (19, 20) als aus Paulus nachgetragen ansehen, und bei Lucas streichen. Dazu hat Blass die Einsicht und den Mut gehabt. Und das ist in der Tat das Richtige.'

21–23. PREDICTION OF THE BETRAYAL

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 18–21; Matt. xxvi. 21–25)

21 'But, behold, the hand of him that is betraying me is with me
22 on the table. For the Son of man indeed goeth, as it hath been
determined: but woe unto that man through whom he is betrayed!'
23 And they began to argue among themselves, which of them it
might be who was about to do this.

The prediction follows the Last Supper rites. It is shorter than the version in Mark, and perhaps as both B. and J. Weiss think, may come, at least as regards 21 and 23, from another source. The prediction is purely general. There is no hint or mention of Judas.

21. πλήν. This particle is variously translated. Many commentators render it by 'But.' B. Weiss denies that it can have an adversative sense, and renders, 'Moreover.' It refers, he thinks, to the repeated allusions to Jesus's death in 15–18. The event is very near. The connection of 21 with 20 or 19 is in any case poor

and artificial, and there is reason in what Loisy says: 'Luc emploie volontiers le mot πλήν dans ses combinaisons rédactionnelles, à défaut de transition meilleure' (*E. S.* II. p. 516, n. 6).

The phrase 'The hand of him that is betraying me is with me on the table' must be taken generally. It does not refer to a particular hand, but means that 'one of those who are eating with me will betray me.'

22. ὅτι must here be rendered 'For.' This verse, whatever may be the case with 21 and 23, seems to depend on Mark xiv. 21. For 'as is written,' Luke has 'as it has been determined.' The change is perhaps due, as B. Weiss thinks, to the fact that Luke could not find a particular passage in Scripture to which reference could be made.

23. The disciples discuss among themselves who the man alluded to by Jesus could possibly be. B. Weiss not unreasonably observes how totally different is the wording of this verse from Mark xiv. 19.

Holtzmann thinks that Luke wanted to adorn the last meeting together of Jesus and his disciples with farewell speeches, and therefore, as an introduction to these, he transposed the prediction of the betrayal and placed it after the Last Supper.

W. thinks that the transposition is intended to obliterate the distinction between Passover meal and Last Supper, which distinction is effected in Mark by the prediction coming between the 'meal' and the 'supper.' It is doubtful whether W. makes the case for his own view of Luke more cogent when he adds: 'Luke's version of the supper is not the original one, however ingenious it be. Mark's version is confirmed by Matthew and by Paul. Luke transformed Mark's version in order to change the supper into the Passover, which Mark had not succeeded in doing.' 'Er hat das getan dem Zusammenhang der Erzählung zu lieb, aber vielleicht auch zu dem Zweck, eine Fortsetzung der jüdischen Paschafeier seitens der Christen zu bekämpfen. Dieses Pascha sollte das letzte sein und bleiben, bis zum Eintritt des Reiches Gottes. Das gemeinsame Brotbrechen der Christen wird dadurch nicht angetastet, da es einen ganz anderen Ursprung hat.'

24–30. WHO IS THE GREATEST?

(*Cp.* Mark x. 42–45; Matt. xx. 25–28, xix. 28)

24 And a contention arose among them, which of them should
25 be accounted as greatest. And he said unto them, 'The kings
of the nations lord it over them; and they that exercise authority

26 over them are called benefactors. But with you it shall not be
so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the youngest;
27 and the leader as the servant. For which is greater, he that
sitteth at table, or he that serveth? is not he that sitteth at
28 table? but I am among you as one that serveth. Yet ye are
29 they who have stood fast with me in my temptations. And I
appoint to you, even as my Father appointed dominion unto me,
30 that ye are to eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and to
sit on thrones ruling the twelve tribes of Israel.

At this point Luke quite departs from the order of the narrative of Mark. He first inserts a short paragraph (24–27), which may be compared with Mark x. 35–45; Matt. xx. 20–28. These sections he had omitted in their original place, and what he now inserts is from another source than Mark. It corresponds especially with Mark x. 42–45; Matt. xx. 25–28. Verses 25–30 may all come from Q, but they are made up of two distinct portions which were only joined together by the redactor (25–27, 28–30).

In Mark and Matthew the special request of the sons of Zebedee introduces the words of Jesus on ranks and service. In Luke this introduction is omitted, and the irritation of the other disciples is changed into a general dispute or contention. One cannot help feeling that on this occasion, after the Last Supper and the prediction of the betrayal, such a contention (*φιλονεικία*) is quite out of place. The transition is perhaps made a little easier by what Luke has in 23. For the discussion (*συζήτησις*) as to who among them could be evil enough to betray the Master leads on to the contention (*φιλονεικία*) as to who, on the contrary, was the best and greatest of them. M. Loisy, on the other hand, thinks that the quarrel as to the first place might have naturally followed Jesus's declarations that he would eat and drink no more till he did so in the Kingdom, seeing that these words would have stimulated the hopes of the apostles, that they contain no explicit allusion to his death, and that perhaps originally they did not include even any implicit allusion to that event (*E. S.* II. p. 543).

24. 'Which of them is accounted to be greatest?' So R.V. But the meaning is not absolutely clear. B. Weiss interprets: 'Who in Jesus's eyes was the greatest?' Holtzmann: 'Who would be the greatest in the coming Kingdom?' Perhaps the simplest interpretation is to neglect the *δοκεῖ* and to suppose that the meaning here is much the same as ix. 46, namely: 'Who is the greatest?'

The frequent discussion of this problem in the Gospels, and the constant insistence upon humility and service, show that very soon after Jesus's death urgent need arose to recall the Master's teaching upon this subject.

25. Much as Mark x. 42. Luke's variant, 'Those who lord it over them are called "benefactors,"' is admirably ironical; all the more so, as several Hellenistic kings had been given, or given themselves, the title of εὐεργέτης ('benefactor').

26. Jesus does not deal with the question raised in 24 directly. In Luke's version he seems to assume that there are already among them those who have greater authority and those who have less. He assumes, in other words, the existence of the young Christian Church. He who has a greater office and more exalted place in the community is only to use this place and office for more effective service.

This verse corresponds with Mark x. 43, but the wording is peculiar to Luke. Acts v. 6, 10, shows that the word ὁ νεώτερος was used in the community in a semi-technical sense.

27. Mark illustrated his word διάκονος ('servant') by the life, and specially by the death, of Jesus: 'He came not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many.' In Luke the illustration is apparently taken from what Jesus has done at the supper. He serves his disciples there by giving them food and drink. In John xiii. he even washes their feet. But the allusion to the supper, and, still more, the making Jesus's service consist in giving the disciples food and drink, seem rather strained. J. Weiss ably discusses this verse in that remarkable commentary of his, which, in spite of certain prejudices or prepossessions, is so full of suggestive thought and throws so much light upon the Gospel narrative. 'What is the meaning of "serving" here? In this connection it seems as if it could only mean that Jesus in some way serves, or waits upon, his disciples at the meal; *i.e.* it seems an allusion to the washing of their feet recorded only in John xiii. (For giving them their bread or wine was no "service," but *Hausvater-Tätigkeit.*) But is this conceivable? Did Luke know the story of the washing? or does our recension of Luke imply a knowledge of John xiii.? Perhaps, however, these sayings only suggest these puzzles because they are fitted in to the setting of the Last Supper. If we look at them by themselves, apart from their setting, we realize that "sitting at table" and "waiting" are mere metaphors. In actual life he who sits at table is "greater" than the "servant": but Jesus was among them as one who rendered them "services," and yet there could be no question who was the greater. So regarded the saying (27) is fairly parallel to

Mark x. 45, only that in Luke with far greater cogency the whole life's work of Jesus, and not merely his death, is considered as a service to his disciples. The MS. D has a curious variant reading in verse 26 (after the word "youngest"): "And let the leader be rather like the servant than like him that sitteth at table. For I came among you, not as he who sitteth at table, but as the servant, and ye have grown in (or through) my service." In this reading no one could have thought of the washing of the feet, and this speaks for its authenticity.'

We may also note that D in 26 *a* reads *μικρότερος* instead of *νεώτερος*, and the S.S. reads *μικρός*. One of these may be the older reading. In fact it would seem that Luke's version is older and more authentic than Mark's. We have seen that this is one of the special passages on which B. Weiss relies to prove that Q has been used by Mark, and not only used but altered. See notes on Mark, p. 258. Loisy holds that the reading *νεώτερος* can be defended, and that, even as it now stands, Luke's version of the section 25–27 is more authentic than Mark's. 'The youngest,' he says, 'is opposed to the oldest, and is the equivalent of the servant, because according to Jewish custom, afterwards followed by the Christian community, the honours of presiding and precedence were reserved for the elders, while the duty of service was imposed upon the younger members of a banquet or a society. But the gospel only knows of service. Jesus teaches this by reminding his disciples that he had always borne himself towards them and among them as their servant. His words contain no allusion to the Passover meal or to the washing of the feet, which we may rather suppose that John has conceived on the basis of this passage. Nor do they directly refer to his mission (and still less to his death) considered as a service of redemption, or signify that true grandeur consists in such a service, although Mark may have desired to understand them in that sense. The form of the words in Luke has a primitive stamp of simple moral truth, and makes the speculative and theological character of the interpretation which Mark put upon them stand out the more clearly' (*E. S.* II. p. 243).

28–30. Now follows a promise of special honour to the Twelve. Though true greatness is service, yet there is such a thing, even in the perfected Kingdom, as special posts and places of honour. But the connection of 28–30 with 24–27 seems very loose and rather awkward. The passage itself has its parallel in Matt. xix. 28.

28. 'Ye are they who have stood fast, or held out, with me in my temptations.' What temptations are these? 'Outward persecutions and sufferings,' says W., 'which it is assumed that Jesus has already experienced. Only the Twelve have held out

with Jesus, and therefore they are selected for special honour. According to Mark they are not entitled to this praise, and it is somewhat restricted in Luke in the following verses 31-34.'

Just because the temptations must be persecutions, the verse in its present form must surely be later than Jesus. J. Weiss, on the contrary, says that we have here 'ein sonst nicht vorkommender, aber unmittelbar überzeugender und ergreifender Zug, der das Bild Jesu sehr bedeutsam ergänzt.' To me it is not at all 'überzeugend.' Nor to Loisy. 'L'allusion aux tentations du Christ répond plutôt aux spéculations du christianisme primitif qu'à une tradition historique.' He regards the verse as an editorial link.

29. W. and J. Weiss make *βασιλείαν* the object of *διατίθεμαι*, as well as of *διέθετο*. Hence they translate: 'I appoint to you dominion even as my Father appointed it to me.' Jesus, who is about to die, makes his will: he bequeaths, or appoints to, his disciples, the dominion to which his Father had appointed him. As Jesus has been appointed by God to have dominion in the new Kingdom, so it is in his hand to appoint whom he will to take part in rule or dominion in this Kingdom.

'Kingdom' is therefore used in a slightly different sense in 29 and in 30. In 29 without the article it means 'dominion,' 'rule'; in 30 with the article it means 'the Kingdom.' The verb *διατίθεμαι* means 'appoint,' 'bequeath.' W. thinks that it is chosen in conscious reference to Mark xiv. 24. The *διαθήκη* is not interpreted as 'covenant,' but as 'will' or 'testament.' This seems doubtful. Loisy would render, 'assign.' It is a sort of solemn assignment, not a testamentary disposition.

Holtzmann makes the object of 'I appoint' or 'bequeath' what follows in the next verse. The meaning is much the same. 'Even as my Father appointed dominion to me, so do I appoint to you that you should eat,' &c. I have followed Holtzmann in my translation.

The metaphor in *διατίθεμαι*, appropriate as regards Jesus, is inappropriately used as regards God. (But *cp.* the usage in the Greek translation of 2 Ch. vii. 18.)

30. See Matt. xix. 28. The main point in the promise to the disciples is contained in the second half of the verse. They are not only to share in the joys of the perfected Kingdom, to partake of the Messianic meal; but they are to occupy a post or place of honour, and to rule over the regenerated Israel. It is noteworthy that S.S. has 'eat and drink *with me*.' Merx supposes that the extra words were deleted in our existing Greek MSS., because the idea that Jesus would eat and drink with the disciples became impossible or difficult for the later Christology. An especial reference to the last Judgment is probably not intended, at least

not in the original saying. The wording of both Matt. xix. 28 and Luke xxii. 30 is open to suspicion. '*My* Kingdom' does not sound like words of the historic Jesus. But we may assume that Jesus did make a promise, or held out a hope, of this kind to the Twelve, to be fulfilled at the accomplishment of the Kingdom. Note that it is made to the Twelve (so even more specifically in Matthew); hence the impropriety of the present position of the verse in Luke is clear, though Luke has omitted the twelve thrones to soften the awkwardness, while keeping the twelve tribes.

Völter thinks that the second half of verse 30 has been added later. 29 and 30*a* are an original word of Jesus; 30*b* was added. To sit at a table and to sit on a throne are incompatible mixtures. Matthew uses only the latter part of the verse (*Das messianische Bewusstsein*, p. 17). Or we may say that Luke combines the two authentic traditions about the service and the thrones in one place.

31–34. THE PREDICTION OF THE DENIAL OF PETER

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 26–31; Matt. xxvi. 30–35)

31 'Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath demanded to sift you as
32 wheat: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not. And
33 when thou hast repented, strengthen thy brethren.' And he said
unto him, 'Lord, I am ready to go with thee, both unto prison
34 and unto death.' And he said, 'I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall
not crow to-day, until thou shalt have thrice denied that thou
knowest me.'

Still making the speech of Jesus, begun in verse 25, to continue in the two curious verses 31 and 32, which are peculiar to him only, Luke now passes on to the narrative in Mark about the prediction of Peter's denial. Or are both 31, 32, and the sequel 33, 34 taken from a separate written source? So B. Weiss. They come from L and join on to 23, whereas the intervening verses 24–30 had come from Q.

31. The praise which was accorded to the apostles in 28 is here considerably qualified. But, so far as they yielded to temptation, it was the devil who tempted them. He wanted to get them into his power. (For the metaphor *cp.* Amos ix. 9.) He has 'asked' God to let him try his power over them. The word ἐξητήσατο apparently implies that he has asked and obtained permission. Hence Dr Moffatt renders, 'has obtained his request.' The idea is borrowed from the story of Job. Satan hopes that through the sieve of temptation in which he will shake them they

will all fall, like chaff, upon the ground. Though Luke omits, as unsuitable to his general plan of the crucifixion and the resurrection, the words of Mark, in xiv. 50 ('and they all abandoned him and fled'), the fact which they record is nevertheless here implied.

32. Jesus has, however, put up a special petition to God for Peter, so that he may pass successfully through the crisis of temptation. He will stumble, but only momentarily. He will regain his faith. Then let him be the first to strengthen and rekindle the faith of his brethren.

Both verses seem to look back and reflect upon the traditional history. The apostles, as W. says, did lose their faith, first and foremost among them Peter. But Peter regained his faith, and then quickened the faith of the others.

'Es schimmert ganz deutlich die Tatsache durch dass Petrus zuerst den Auferstandenen geschaut hat und dadurch der Begründer des Evangeliums und der Gemeinde geworden ist.' The warning addressed to him passes over into a recognition, though necessarily put into the imperative mood. This recognition is not less marked, though more delicate, than that of Matt. xvi. 17–19. 'Überhaupt ragt Petrus bei Lucas nicht minder hervor, wie bei Mt., und weit stärker als bei Marcus dem angeblichen Petriner.' Similarly Loisy. 'The two passages are closely parallel; the environment only is different: both show how Simon will become Peter.' He is called Simon here to oppose 'the natural man' to the apostle, who was to play so eminent a part in the Christian Church. 'The words attributed to Jesus reflect a very accurate recollection, and a very definite feeling of the Christian consciousness, touching the place and the work of Peter in the apostolic community' (*E. S.* II. p. 552).

J. Weiss makes a desperate attempt to keep the first part of 32 for Jesus. For he says that—read without prejudice or context—it would imply that Jesus was confident that, through his prayer, he would successfully preserve the faith of Peter from falling. Therefore, as this confidence was not fulfilled, the half verse is authentic.

ἐπιστρέψας, *i.e.* when you have 'returned' or 'repented.'

33 corresponds roughly to Mark xiv. 29, but the wording is wholly different. The 'prison' anticipates Acts v. 18, viii. 3–5.

34. Now follows the traditional prediction. It has really been anticipated in 31. 'The cock shall not crow to-day until' &c.; this seems, says W., to mean here merely, 'before dawn.'

35–38. Purse and Sword

(Luke only)

35 And he said unto them, ‘When I sent you forth without purse
and wallet and shoes, lacked ye any thing?’ And they said,
36 ‘Nothing.’ Then said he unto them, ‘But now, he that hath
a purse, let him take it, and likewise his wallet; and he that hath
37 no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one. For I say unto
you, that this word which is written must be fulfilled in me: *and
he was reckoned among the transgressors:* for that which concerneth
38 me hath now an end.’ And they said, ‘Lord, behold, here are two
swords.’ And he said unto them, ‘It is enough.’

The last speech of Jesus to the apostles, which had begun in 25, and of which the first section, with its two divisions (25–27, 28–30), had ended with verse 30, and the second section with verse 34, is here continued and concluded in a third section of great interest and marked peculiarity, only found in Luke. In its vocabulary verse 35 corresponds not with ix. 3, but with x. 4, which passage came not from Mark, but from the special source Q. It is possible that 35–38 may also be due to this source. So B. Weiss (*Quellen*, A, p. 90).

35, 36. These verses have to be taken closely together. Their connection with 37 and 38 must be separately considered. 36 clearly relates to the period after Jesus's death, when the disciples will have to undergo, and prepare and fit themselves for, a time of stress and opposition and resistance. Before, upon their early journey, they needed nought: they had to provide themselves with nothing. They met with a friendly reception. (They encountered no ‘temptations’ by the way, such as are implied in 28.) Their wants were supplied by sympathetic auditors. Things will soon be very different. In their new missionary journeys and enterprises they must depend upon themselves. He who has a purse [*i.e.* money] must take that purse with him; he who has a wallet must take that wallet with him. He who has no sword had best sell his cloak, and with the proceeds of the sale buy a sword. These last words imply that *all* will need swords. For the dangers against which the swords are to protect them will befall them all. He who has no other means with which to get a sword than the sale of his cloak, had best dispense with the cloak rather than be without a sword.

These words are in any case highly remarkable. But they surely cannot be connected with, or refer to the same situation, as that reflected in verse 38. They cannot bid the disciples prepare for the arrest of Jesus, and resist it. For, in that case, what is the meaning of the reference to x. 4, and the contrast with it? What the meaning of the purse and the wallet?

The words of 36 must, as I have said, refer to the coming persecutions of the disciples after Jesus's death. Are the 'swords' in that verse to be taken literally? Some think not. Thus B. Weiss would regard the words as a proverbial and metaphorical expression, meaning that the disciples must prepare themselves for a season of sore conflict, which the enmity of their fellow-countrymen will bring upon them. And so Loisy, in so far as the sense which Luke would have us take is concerned. It is not however the meaning of the warning 'que l'on peut soupçonner derrière la glose et l'interprétation de l'évangéliste' (*E. S.* II. p. 555). B. Weiss holds that Jesus would imply that he can now no longer protect and look after the disciples. They must depend upon themselves and be prepared for sore dangers. But 38 is the addition of Luke, who invented the disciples' misunderstanding of Jesus's words, and placed the passage in its present environment (*Quellen*, A, p. 90).

But it is at least doubtful whether such a view does justice to what J. Weiss calls the 'extremely warlike' tone of verse 36. He points out that it contradicts injunctions of Jesus forbidding active resistance; that it contradicts the whole spirit of early Christianity, and is not to be explained by the situation, conduct, or temper of the earliest Christian communities. Hence he thinks it inconceivable that this strange and unique injunction can be a later invention. It is only intelligible as the product of a special mood and situation of Jesus which did not recur. This mood (*Stimmung*) we already know from xii. 49. Jesus goes to Jerusalem with the distinct consciousness that he is to 'kindle a fire' there, which to himself will be fatal. But he hopes that his disciples will be able to fight their way out. ('Aber seine Jünger, dass hofft er, werden und mögen sich durchschlagen.')

37. The word 'for' (γάρ), as so frequently, connects two passages which seem really, except for the 'swords' in each, to have little to do with each other. The best connection one can make is to suppose that the new injunctions to the disciples are based upon his coming death, which is here announced.

The reference is to Isaiah liii. 12, which is not elsewhere quoted in Jesus's speeches. The quotation, as J. Weiss says, seems out of place here in this 'warlike' passage and mood. But Jesus may have said what follows. 'For so far as regards myself—*i.e.* my appointed lot—that which concerns me—*that* has now an end.' The disciples' life with the Master is on the point of ending. A new life of danger is to begin for them. Hence the need for swords. The quotation may have been added later to show that the Master's doom was predetermined and prearranged, that it was a fulfilment of a divine decree. But the meaning of τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ is not quite clear. If we connect it with the quotation, it should perhaps be rendered: 'For that which has been said of me has now its end.'

38. If, however, 37 can, more or less awkwardly or more or less well, be connected with 36, this is far less the case, as it seems to me, with 38. For 38 clearly refers to a preparation against *immediate* need; in other words, to the approaching arrest. It can only with great strain be made to fit in with Jesus's injunction in 36. Moreover, 37 does not cohere with 38. In 37, as W. observes, Jesus says, 'I must die, even as the Scripture predicts.' In 38 the disciples say, 'Here are two swords.' The two utterances are disparate and disconnected.

What is the starting-point? W. thinks 38. It looks forward to 49. Perhaps, then, 37 contained originally the announcement of the imminent danger of a secret attack. The disciples think they can ward this off by the two swords which they possess. The means are ludicrously insufficient, but Jesus, in sad resignation, declares them to be adequate. ('Diese Mittel sind lächerlich ungenügend, Jesus erklärt sie aber in schmerzlicher Resignation für ausreichend und lässt die Jünger gewähren.') Then 35 and 36 were added on, on account of the word 'sword' occurring in them as well as in 38. Perhaps they were intended to explain the contradiction that whereas, before, Jesus had even prohibited the use of purse and wallet, he now suddenly permits a sword. Loisy also holds that the original meaning of 38 had no reference to the ulterior lot of the disciples, but to the actual present danger which was rapidly growing around him and them. 'Le Sauveur prévoit un attentat contre sa personne, et il a l'intention d'y résister.' But the arrest was to take place under conditions which would make the two swords not merely insufficient, but useless (*E. S.* II. p. 557). He thought the two swords would be enough. They turned out to be useless. Jesus, however, had originally intended to meet force with force.

One means of connecting 38 with 36 would be to suppose that the disciples misunderstand, as usual, what Jesus has said, and what he implies, intends and foresees. They just catch on to the mere mention of swords, and say, 'Here are two.' Then Jesus, perceiving they have failed to understand him, replies, 'It is enough,' half ironically, and breaks off the conversation. This interpretation of the disciples' words and of Jesus's reply can be used either for the view that 36 refers to what the disciples must literally do after Jesus's death, or for the view that the swords are to be taken metaphorically. In either case, Jesus referred to what would happen after his death; whereas the disciples take his words to refer to the emergency of the moment. But it cannot be said that this interpretation of 38, and this means of connecting it with 36, are likely or natural.

Professor Burkitt supports the 'misunderstanding' explanation. But he finds the passage highly original, and a strong support to his contention that Luke in his divergent account of the Passion draws from a very ancient source, perhaps Q. The sword passage he regards as among the saddest words in the Gospels, and the mournful irony with which they are pervaded seems to him 'wholly alien from the kind of utterance which a Christian Evangelist would invent for his Master.' Yet 'it is impossible to believe that the command to buy a sword was meant literally or seriously; it is all a piece of ironical foreboding.' The words show that there was in Jesus 'a vein of what I have no other name for but playfulness, a tender and melancholy playfulness indeed, but all the more remarkable that it comes to outward expression in moments of danger and despondency....This kind of playfulness is totally alien from ignorant fanaticism, and indeed it is totally alien from the general spirit of early Christianity. That it appears at all in the Gospels is in itself a proof that the Evangelists, and the sources from which they drew, sometimes remembered better than they understood' (*The Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 140–142).

It is, however, noticeable that the disciples are, at any rate, not wholly unarmed. Some critics, notably Pfleiderer, lay great stress upon this passage and especially upon 38. They think that, in a more or less disguised form, it contains a most important historic fact. Swords, says Pfleiderer, are only bought in order to be used. He thinks that what Jesus feared was the weapon of some assassin; he did not anticipate a formal arrest. Hired murderers he feared, and from them he sought to protect himself; he had not imagined that a band, despatched for this purpose by the authorities, would arrest him. When he saw the uselessness of resistance, he said 'Stop; no further' (verse 51). The passage about the purchase of the swords is thus regarded by Pfleiderer as historical and most important. It shows that Jesus went to Jerusalem to conquer and to establish the Kingdom, and not to die. All the predictions of death put into his mouth are spurious: they are all prophecies after the event. He foresaw danger, opposition, trouble; he feared the event (*cp.* xii. 49–51), but he did not despair. Even Gethsemane only implies that the coming struggle was fraught with peril; it does not imply, in fact it is inconsistent with, the belief that his death was a necessary part, or rather the essential condition, of the whole purpose of his mission. It does not imply—on the contrary, it is inconsistent with—the belief that only through his death could men be reconciled to God.

39–46. GETHSEMANE

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 32–42; Matt. xxvi. 36–46)

39 And he came out, and went, as he was wont, to the mount
40 of Olives; and his disciples also followed him. And when he
arrived at the place, he said unto them, 'Pray that ye come not
41 into temptation.' And he withdrew from them about a stone's
42 throw, and he knelt down, and prayed, saying, 'Father, if thou be
willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but
thine, be done.'

43 And an angel from heaven appeared unto him, strengthening
44 him. And in an agony of fear he prayed still more earnestly:
and his sweat became like great drops of blood falling upon the
ground.

45 And when he rose up from prayer, and came to his disciples,
46 he found them sleeping for sorrow. And he said unto them, 'Why
sleep ye? arise and pray, that ye come not into temptation.'

39. Luke tells the story of Gethsemane in a somewhat shortened form. He does not give its name. In fact he only mentions the Mount of Olives; and the words 'at the place' in 40 sound awkward: they need an addition. The peculiarities of Luke's story are explained, as usual, by B. Weiss on the theory that his narrative is taken from L; by Loisy, on the theory that he knew and used 'the source of Mark.'

40. What Mark has later on (xiv. 38), Luke inserts here. But the 'temptation' is for him probably the outward danger (so W.; *cp.* verse 28). The disciples are to pray that it may not come. As a matter of fact they succumb to it. Loisy thinks that the original words were, 'Pray that *I* come not into temptation.' This was the fundamental idea which the earliest tradition had attached to the prayers of Gethsemane and to the death of Christ, namely: death was the supreme temptation which God willed Jesus to undergo, and which Jesus accepted and victoriously passed through.

The scene at Gethsemane is the pendant to the scene in the desert. Luke has omitted the 'I,' but he has not definitely substituted a 'you,' though, of course, the Greek as it stands, 'I' (με) being omitted, means 'pray that *you* come not into temptation' (*E. S.* II. p. 562).

41, 42. Luke records only one act of prayer.

43, 44. These verses are peculiar to Luke. In some MSS. they are wanting; some think them a later insertion. They seem out of tune with Luke's apparent desire elsewhere not to delineate or allow any struggle in Jesus's complete readiness to accept the divine will. The salient words in Mark xiv. 33, 34 have been omitted.

44. Unless the angel strengthened him to pray more intently, the order of the two verses seems unsatisfactory.
ἀγωνία. An agony of fear. 'Todesangst' is the rendering of W., and of J. Weiss. The 'bloody sweat' may be intended literally, or the phrase may be rhetorical, or the sweat may be compared in its amount, its colour, or its density to drops of blood.

45. They fall asleep from grief. The cause is a sort of excuse. In Mark this is not so.

46. The warning against 'temptation' is again repeated. The disciples are to get up and rouse themselves in order to pray; not because the betrayer is at hand.

47–53. THE ARREST

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 43–52; Matt. xxvi. 47–56)

47 And while he yet spoke, behold a crowd, and the man called
Judas, one of the Twelve, at their head, and he came near unto
48 Jesus to kiss him. But Jesus said unto him, 'Judas, betrayest
49 thou the Son of man with a kiss?' And when his companions
saw what was coming, they said unto him, 'Lord, shall we smite
50 with the sword?' And one of them smote the servant of the
51 high priest, and cut off his right ear. And Jesus answered and
said, 'Let this suffice.' And he touched his ear, and healed him.

52 Then Jesus said unto the chief priests and the generals of the
temple and the elders, who had come up to him, 'Have ye come
53 out, as against a thief, with swords and clubs? When I was daily
with you in the temple, ye stretched out no hands against me:
but this is your hour, and the power of darkness.'

47. Mark's narrative is contracted; of whom the 'crowd' is composed is not stated.

ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰούδας. J. Weiss translates 'der erwähnte Judas,' the above-mentioned Judas, referring to verse 3. W. renders 'Einer von den Zwölfen, mit Namen Judas,' 'One of the Twelve, called Judas.' The Greek wording is rather peculiar; the repetition of 'one of the Twelve' recalls Mark xiv. 43. B. Weiss, on the contrary, believes that Luke here follows his special source, L.

It is assumed that the 'kiss' was the sign agreed upon between Judas and his band. Luke's language is intended to indicate that the odious kiss was not actually carried out. 'Wouldst thou seal thy betrayal by a kiss?' says Jesus indignantly.

49. Instead of some resistance, as in Mark, being shown by the disciples after the arrest, Luke changes the order. The resistance precedes the arrest. Before Jesus can answer, the sword is used.

51. Jesus says: ἐᾶτε ἕως τούτου. Apparently this means either, 'Suffer them to proceed and complete my arrest'; or, 'Let what you have just done suffice; let there be no *more* resistance.'

The story of the arrest was gradually bound to include a miraculous incident, 'un miracle assez mesquin,' as Loisy calls it. Thus what remained of the ear (it was the right ear, says Luke) was touched by Jesus, and it became again whole. Here again Harnack scents the Doctor. Jesus to him was the great Physician and Healer. 'Unverantwortlich wäre es gewesen wenn er als Wunderarzt nicht geheilt hätte.' Luke had no source for this. 'Weil es so sein musste, ist es so gewesen' (*Lukas der Arzt*, p. 130).

52. Now follows the speech of Jesus in Mark xiv. 48, 49. Luke apparently thought that the words were inappropriate as addressed to the arresting band. He therefore makes the chief priests and Elders present in person! J. Weiss thinks that the text ran originally, 'Jesus spoke to those who had come up to him,' &c., and that the Greek words ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ στρατηγοὺς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ πρεσβυτέρους ('chief priests and captains of the Temple and Elders') are a gloss added from verse 4. B. Weiss supports the existing reading of Luke. It is more accurate than Mark, from whom 52 *b* is interpolated. For these words are unsuitable as addressed to the high priests and Elders (*Quellen*, A, p. 220). But the idea of the authorities coming out in person to make the arrest can surely not be based on history, though it is true that

the words of Jesus, themselves doubtless unhistoric, are more suitable as addressed to the authorities than as addressed to the crowd or the arresting band.

53. The last words are peculiar to Luke: 'But this is your hour, and the power of darkness.' The phrase sounds almost Johannine. In numerous details Luke marks the transition from the old Marcan tradition and wording to the conceptions and traditions of the fourth Gospel. 'This is your hour.' Night and darkness befit your deed. You are men of darkness. The power which you exercise now is the power which darkness gives you. The words are chosen to suit the situation, but they have a deeper meaning too. 'Your hour' is also the hour which was predestined for you. 'The darkness' is also the darkness of the devil and his kingdom (*cp.* John iii. 19–21, xii. 35).

Luke says nothing of the flight of the disciples. For, according to him, they remained at Jerusalem, or in the neighbourhood, where the visions of the resurrected Jesus were vouchsafed to them.

54, 55. Jesus is brought to the House of the High Priest

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 53, 54; Matt. xxvi. 57, 58)

54 Then they seized him, and led him away, and brought him into the high priest's house. And Peter followed at a distance.
55 And they kindled a fire in the middle of the court, and sat down together, and Peter sat down among them.

54. Jesus is taken, as in Mark, to the high priest's house; but the meeting of the Sanhedrin apparently does not take place in the house.

55. At first, at any rate, Jesus is not, as in Mark, at once taken upstairs, but is left in the courtyard, bound and under guard. By adopting this variant tradition, or, if he does not here follow another source, by himself making this variation, Luke is able to make Jesus present at Peter's denial, and we get the wonderfully dramatic incident of 61.

56–62. Peter's Denial

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 66–72; Matt. xxvi. 69–71)

56 But one of the maids saw him as he sat by the fire, and she
57 gazed upon him, and said, 'This man also was with him.' And he

58 denied it, saying, 'Woman, I know him not.' And after a little
while somebody else saw him, and said, 'Thou also art one of
59 them.' And Peter said, 'Man, I am not.' And about the space of
one hour after, another confidently asserted, saying, 'Of a truth
60 this fellow also was with him: for he is a Galilæan.' And Peter
said, 'Man, I know not what thou sayest.' And immediately,
61 while he yet spoke, the cock crew. And the Lord turned, and
looked at Peter. And Peter remembered the word of the Lord,
how he had said unto him, 'Before the cock crow to-day, thou
62 wilt deny me thrice.' And he went out, and wept bitterly.

Luke makes the denial scene precede the 'trial' of Jesus before the Sanhedrin; for he recognizes only one 'trial,' held in the early morning, and not at night (*cp.* notes on Mark). Luke makes slight changes in the narrative. Thus, in 58, the speaker is a man. Luke's variant narrative is either due to a special source (B. Weiss) or to the use of Mark's source (Loisy). It may be, as Loisy thinks, that the source of Mark knew of no nocturnal sitting, and that in the omission of it Luke followed this source. But for some of Luke's changes the hypothesis of a combination of Mark with another source altogether (B. Weiss's L) seems in some respects more probable (*Quellen*, A, pp. 221, 222).

61. Jesus turns round and looks at Peter. A sublime touch, but probably not historic. It is doubtful whether Jesus remained in the court all this while.

62. This verse is wanting in the old Latin translation, and is probably an insertion from Matt. xxvi. 75; but, if an insertion, it is an excellent one.

63–65. ILL-TREATMENT OF JESUS BY THE GUARD

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 65; Matt. xxvi. 67, 68)

63 And the men that held Jesus fast mocked him and beat him.
64 And they blindfolded him, and asked him, saying, 'Prophesy, who
65 is it that struck thee?' And many other words they said, reviling him.

Luke inserts this incident here and thereby avoids any break between the 'trial' and taking Jesus to Pilate. Moreover, the abuse is confined to the guard—a far more probable version.

Luke here combines some touches of Mark with some touches of Matthew. Both Luke and Matthew have: 'who is it who struck thee?' How is this to be explained? B. Weiss says, through common oral tradition; others by Luke being influenced by Matthew; and a third explanation is that the text of Luke was at an early date assimilated to that of Matthew.

66–71. The Trial before the Sanhedrin

(*Cp.* Mark xiv. 55–64; Matt. xxvi. 59–66)

66 And as soon as it was day, the elders of the people and the
chief priests and the scribes came together, and they led him
67 away to their council chamber, and said, 'If thou art the Messiah,
tell us.' And he said unto them, 'If I tell you, ye will not be-
68, 69 lieve: and if I ask, ye will not answer. But from now the Son
70 of man will sit on the right hand of the power of God.' Then
said they all, 'Art thou, then, the Son of God?' And he said
71 unto them, 'Ye say that I am.' And they said, 'What further
need have we of witness? for we ourselves have heard from his
own mouth.'

Luke's account of the trial is shorter than Mark's or Matthew's —six verses instead of Mark's ten and Matthew's eight. He says nothing about blasphemy, and nothing about the destruction of the Temple. W. draws deductions from this to support his own theory. 'Luke omits the word "blasphemy" in 71; he does not venture to call Jesus's acknowledgment of his Messiahship by that name. He knew what the *real* blasphemy was, and therefore he suppresses the *word*, even as he suppresses the *thing*.'

66. Luke has only one trial, and that by day—a more historic version, thinks J. Weiss. The *τὸ πρεσβυτέριον*, the presbytery, is here distinguished from the Sanhedrin. The presbytery is the court, the Sanhedrin the court-house. So Holtzmann. W. says: 'The presbytery seems to be the name of the authority (*Behörde*), consisting of high priests and scribes; the Sanhedrin is the name of the court (*Gericht*).' 'They led him away,' *i.e.* not the members of the authority or the court, but the men who had arrested him. 'And they said,' *i.e.* the members of the court.

Luke has nothing about the false witnesses, and the high priest is no longer the interlocutor. Does his version rest upon a separate, or, at all events, an additional, source? This seems highly probable whether that source be L or no. Loisy is doubtful. 'Les détails qu'il insère dans la séance matinale du sanhédrin semblent y avoir été transportés de la séance nocturne supposée par Marc' (*E. S.* I. p. 161).

Luke separates the Messiah from the Son of God. The true Messiah is also the Son of God; but the second title was already greater and more important than the first. It is, therefore, reserved for verse 70. The reply of Jesus leads to the deduction: 'Then you claim not merely to be the Messiah, but also the Son of God.' Or, rather: 'Then, whether you claim to be Messiah or not, you do claim to be, what is even more presumptuous, the Son of God.'

67, 68. At first sight an interesting and characteristic reply. It is impossible for Jesus to discuss the matter before people who have made up their minds already, and who, in any case, could not understand him. Some think that Luke must have here followed some more authentic tradition. Brandt, on the other hand, has sought to show that the reply is probably modelled on and borrowed from Jeremiah xxxviii. 15, in the Septuagint version, and is therefore not likely to be historic. The S.S. has an interesting addition: 'And ye would not let me go.' My case is decided; argument is idle. The reason for the omission of the words, if they are genuine, is clear. 'Der menschlich begreifliche Wunsch soll dem Gottmenschen abgesprochen werden' (Merx).

69. *Ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν.* 'From this time forward.' Luke (or his source?) no longer lets Jesus say that the judges will see the coming of the Son of man. For the judges are dead, and did not see it. All he lets Jesus say is that 'from now,' that is, after his death, which is soon to follow, the Son of man will sit at the right hand of God. The Son of man, to Luke, is Jesus. Thus he intends Jesus to say, as W. puts it: 'By killing me now, you will enable me to take my seat at the right hand of God.'

70. The Son of man who sits at the right hand of God is the Son of God. Hence the judges' reply. Jesus's evasive rejoinder follows Matt. xxvi. 64, not Mark's frank admission (see notes on Mark). 'The members of the Sanhedrin realize that the answer of Jesus in 69 goes beyond their first question. For the Evangelist meant to indicate in Jesus's reply that Jesus is Messiah in the fuller Christian sense. And when the judges use the phrase "Son of God," we are to understand that they mean by it what the Evangelist meant by it' (Loisy, *E. S.* II. p. 608).

71. The suppression of the object of 'we have heard' is very curious. W.'s explanation has already been given. And Luke

does not let the Sanhedrin pass any formal verdict. This may be more historic. As J. Weiss says: 'Lukas vermeidet den staatsrechtlichen Fehler dass er das Synedrium ein offizielles Todesurteil aussprechen lässt auf Grund einer "Lästerung," die im juristischen Sinne keine wirkliche Gotteslästerung war. Hierin ist sein Bericht dem des Marcus überlegen.' But Loisy denies that Luke had any other and better source than what had been used by Mark, or that he did not depend on Mark. The omission of the blasphemy charge may have had a number of special reasons. Perhaps (1) Luke omitted the part played by the high priest on purpose; perhaps (2) the rending of the garment would have had no meaning to his Gentile readers; perhaps (3) Luke, realizing that Jesus was formally condemned only by Pilate, omitted, with the condemnation by the Sanhedrin, the blasphemy which motived it; perhaps (4) he did not like to represent Jesus as even unjustly condemned as a blasphemer. Certainly the interpretation of the Gospels is sown thick with 'perhaps'! Merx thinks that ἔτι in 71 which is wanting in the S.S. is an inaccurate addition. The meaning is: 'Why do we need any witnesses at all? We have heard him speak ourselves' (*i.e.* not at the trial, for there he denied, as Merx interprets 70, that he is Messiah or Son of God, but in the Temple and elsewhere). They will be, at once, accusers, witnesses and judges. This seems doubtful.

CHAPTER XXIII

1–5. JESUS BEFORE PILATE

(*Cp.* Mark xv. 1–5; Matt. xxvii. 1, 2, 11–14)

1 And the whole number of them arose, and led him unto Pilate.
2 And they began to accuse him, saying, 'We have found this man
perverting our nation, forbidding to give tribute to the Emperor,
3 and saying that he himself is Messiah, a King.' And Pilate asked
him, saying, 'Art thou the King of the Jews?' And he answered
4 him and said, 'Thou sayest it.' Then said Pilate to the chief
5 priests and to the people, 'I find no guilt in this man.' But
they became the more persistent, saying, 'He stirs up the
people, teaching through all Judæa, beginning from Galilee, unto
here.'

1. The hour of the day is omitted because of xxii. 66.

2. Only Luke, who draws, according to B. Weiss, upon L, gives the contents of the accusation which was made against Jesus by the members of the Sanhedrin before Pilate. The gravamen of the charge is that Jesus was a political agitator, who sought to stir up the people against Rome.

διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος. He perverts and disturbs the people by making them vacillate in their obedience and allegiance to Rome.

As regards the tax, Jesus had said precisely the reverse.

Χριστὸν βασιλέα, 'an anointed King.' Or, 'the Messiah, a King.'

3. J. Weiss argues that, to Luke at any rate, 'Thou sayest' cannot have meant 'pure assent.' For if Jesus admitted that he was king, how could Pilate have said he was guiltless? Perhaps this is to assume more logic in the narrative than is reasonable. B. Weiss attempts to explain the matter by assuming that 3 is an

insertion from Mark by Luke. What is implied in 4 has been omitted. Moreover, the words 'and to the people' in 4 have been added by Luke.

4. The whitewashing of Pilate is carried furthest in Luke. He at once emphatically asserts Jesus's innocence.

5. Like 4, this verse is only found in Luke. The guilt of the Jews is emphasized.

6–16. Pilate and Herod

(Luke only)

6 When Pilate heard that, he asked whether the man were a
7 Galilæan. And when he learnt that he belonged unto the
dominion of Herod, he sent him to Herod, who himself also was
8 at Jerusalem at that time. And when Herod saw Jesus, he was
exceeding glad: for he had for a long time wanted to see him,
because he had heard of him; and he hoped to see some sign
9 performed by him. Then he questioned him with many words;
but he answered him nothing.
10 And the chief priests and scribes stood by, and vehemently
11 accused him. And Herod with his soldiers despised him,
and mocked him, and having arrayed him in fine apparel,
12 he sent him back to Pilate. And on that day Pilate and
Herod became friends with one another; for before they were at
enmity.
13 Then Pilate summoned the chief priests and the rulers and
14 the people, and said unto them, 'Ye have brought this man unto
me, as one that perverts the people: and, behold, I, having examined him before you, have found no guilt in this man touching
15 those things whereof ye accuse him: no, nor yet Herod: for he
sent him back to us; and, lo, nothing worthy of death has been
16 done by him. I will scourge him, therefore, and release him.'

This scene is only found in Luke, and its historical character is dubious. If Jesus appeared before Pilate, was then sent to Herod, and then back to Pilate, he could hardly have been crucified at nine in the morning. Moreover, the incident has been prepared for by Luke in ix. 9, and partly depends upon Herod's desire to see Jesus, which, itself, is unlikely. Loisy also regards the story as unhistorical, though not invented by Luke. He found it in some source (perhaps an ancient redaction of the Gospel of Peter) where the main details of the trial before Pilate were transferred to a trial before Herod (*cp.* 9 with Mark xv. 5; 10 with xv. 3; 11 with xv. 18, 19). It was attempted yet further to whitewash Pilate by making Herod, not Pilate, condemn Jesus. Such an inversion of history Luke could not accept; but he nevertheless borrowed and adapted from this source a short narrative in which the innocence of Jesus is made still more plain, in which Pilate's goodwill is accentuated, and in which the mocking of Jesus is transferred from Roman soldiers to a Jewish chief and his guard.

6. The story is artistically hooked on to the last remark of the high priests, in 5.

7. Herod had come to Jerusalem on account of the festival, or to pay his respects to the Roman governor. Herod is the tetrarch of Galilee, and Jesus is his subject. It was therefore right and proper that his opinion should be asked, especially as there was a divergence of view between Pilate and the Jewish authorities.

8. Herod has heard of the miracles wrought by Jesus. He hopes to have one performed for his own benefit and amusement.

9. Jesus preserves the same attitude of silence before Herod as the two other Gospels had attributed to him before Pilate. B. Weiss regards 9*b* and 10 as added by Luke. They are an echo of Mark xv. 3.

10–12. These three verses are wanting in the S.S., and W. and Merx regard them as a later interpolation. At any rate, 10 must be excluded, for verse 15 shows that the 'priests and scribes' did not hurry off with Jesus to Herod, before whom their presence would be unnatural. But verse 11 is also dubious. It seems to have been put in to do instead of Mark xv. 16–20, which Luke omits. The assumption has to be that, as Jesus is silent and works no miracle, Herod is angry and mocks him. This is, however, not very convincing. Verse 12 is almost childish. The attention which Pilate thus shows to Herod by sending Jesus before him, and the politeness shown by Herod in declining to interfere in the matter, make them good friends. But B. Weiss argues that a remark such as that contained in 12 'nur aus Kreisen stammen kann, wo man über das Verhältniss des Statthalters zum Tetrarchen gut Bescheid wusste' (*Quellen*, A, p. 225). Dr Verrall wrote a most ingenious and subtle article in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, April, 1909 (pp. 321–353), in which he essayed to prove that the entire scene with Herod is strictly historical, if properly understood and properly translated. But that right understanding of Dr Verrall's, especially of verse 11, is hardly likely to win the permanent approval of scholars.

13–16. Pilate repeats what he had already said in verse 4. But his words prepare the way for the Barabbas incident. Verse 15 rounds off the story about Herod, and Pilate is made to say that Herod takes the same view as himself as to Jesus's innocency. It is noticeable that this is an inference which 6–12 had not entirely justified. It would almost seem as if the true conclusion to the Herod scene had been lost, and 10–12 substituted for it. It would be more in accordance with 15, and with Luke's obvious intention to accumulate the burden of guilt upon the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem, if Herod too had openly declared, just like Pilate, that he found Jesus not guilty. And why need Pilate explain to the high priests that Jesus had been sent back to him, when they had been present and knew all about it? But perhaps 9 *b*, 10 were added later. In verse 15 the Syriac versions read: 'I (Pilate) sent him (Jesus) to him (Herod),' instead of 'he (Herod) sent him (Jesus) back to me (Pilate).' B. Weiss holds—and here he makes a good case—that 13–16 are all from L; 'and the people' was added in 13 by Luke. For L by no means shares in the view that the people were now all so hostile to Jesus. Then 18–22 are taken with editorial modifications from Mark, and we hear the voice of L again in 23 and 24.

16. To satisfy the animosity of the Jewish authorities Pilate suggests that Jesus be scourged. Let them be satisfied with that.

18–25. JESUS AND BARABBAS

(*Cp.* Mark xv. 6–15; Matt. xxvii. 15–26)

18 But they cried out all together, saying, 'Away with this man,
19 and release unto us Barabbas: (who on account of a certain riot
which had happened in the city, and also on account of a murder,
20 had been cast into prison. For Pilate was compelled to release
one man to them at the festival.) Then Pilate, wishing to release
21 Jesus, spoke again to them. But they kept crying out, saying,
22 'Crucify him, crucify him.' And he said unto them the third
time, 'Why, what evil has this man done? I have found nothing

worthy of death in him: I will therefore scourge him, and release
23 him.' But they pressed insistently, demanding with loud voices
24 that he should be crucified. And their voices prevailed. And
Pilate gave sentence that their demand should be carried out.
25 And he released unto them him that on account of riot and
murder had been cast into prison, whom they asked for; but
he delivered up Jesus to their will.

18. Luke now takes up and inserts the Barabbas incident from Mark. (17, 'Now he was bound to release unto them at the feast one prisoner' is wanting in the best MSS. S.S. and D place it after 19, and S.S. has it in this form: 'And Pilate was wont to release to them a prisoner upon the festival.' The verse is probably not genuine.) 'They cried out,' *i.e.* as we must suppose, 'the priests, the scribes and the people.' Barabbas is thus introduced quite suddenly, and 19 is added to explain the strange request.

20. Once more Pilate attempts to persuade the Jews to allow him to acquit and release Jesus.

22. He makes a third appeal. Counting verse 4 it is a fourth.

23. The Jews besiege and press him (*ἐπέκειντο*) with loud cries, and their insistent clamour prevails (*κατίσχυον*).

24. *ἐπέκρινεν.* He finally gave judgment that their request should be fulfilled.

25. Once more Luke alludes, rather suddenly, to Barabbas, and it looks as if he did not belong to the main thread of the narrative.

Luke omits the scene in which the soldiers mock and abuse Jesus. Is the motive for this omission, (*a*) because he has used those details in a different way in the scene with Herod; or, (*b*) because he wants to put the conduct of the Romans in as little unfavourable a light as possible? Both reasons are perhaps at play. So too he does not mention that the scourging was carried out, or that Roman soldiers accompanied Jesus to the cross. The omission of the scourging is partly accounted for by verse 16. For the scourging is there regarded and suggested by Pilate as a substitute for the death penalty.

26–32. JESUS AND THE WOMEN OF JERUSALEM

(*Cp.* Mark xv. 21, 27; Matt. xxvii. 32, 38)

26 And as they led him away, they laid hold of one Simon of Cyrene who was passing by from the country, and on him they 27 laid the cross, to carry it after Jesus. And there followed him a great number of people, and also of women, who beat their 28 breasts and lamented him. But Jesus turned unto them and said, 'Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for 29 yourselves, and for your children. For, behold, the days are coming, in which they will say, Happy are the barren, and the wombs that never bore, and the breasts which never gave suck. 30 Then will they begin to say to the mountains, Fall on us; and to 31 the hills, Cover us. For if they do these things to the green tree, what will be done to the dry?'

32 And two others, criminals, were also led along with him to be put to death.

This passage, except verses 26 and 32, is peculiar to Luke. It is almost certainly unhistorical, being made up out of a number of Old Testament reminiscences. Its basis seems to come from Zech. xii. 10–14, where a great mourning is spoken of for him 'whom they have pierced.' Here are found the women, and the beating of the breast. To B. Weiss the passage (except all 26 without the first four words) is from L. The people in L are on Jesus's side. 'Das Volk hat in L keinen Teil an der Ermordung Jesu, sonderen begleitet mitleidsvoll den Zug zur Richtstätte' (*Quellen*, B, p. 161).

28. For the structure of this verse, *cp.* Jer. xxii. 10.

29. *Cp.* Isaiah liv. 1.

30. *Cp.* Hosea x. 8. A literal quotation.

31. We may compare Ezekiel xx. 47 (Hebrew, xxi. 3). The saying seems to mean that if the innocent Jesus has to suffer so cruelly, how far more terrible will be the sufferings of the guilty Jews in the days of visitation! The passage seems to reflect the capture of Jerusalem. Another interpretation is to suppose that the green tree represents not Jesus in his innocence, but Jerusalem in its prosperity, while the dry tree is Jerusalem in its future desolation.

If such deeds are done in a time of prosperity, what horrors may be expected in the dreadful time which is coming? Mr Adeney thinks this interpretation the more probable.

32. This verse prepares the way for what Mark relates in xv. 27.

33–43. THE CRUCIFIXION

(*Cp.* Mark xv. 22–32; Matt. xxvii. 33–44)

33 And when they came to the place which is called the Skull,
there they crucified him, and the criminals, one on his right
34 hand, and the other on the left. Then said Jesus, 'Father,
forgive them; for they know not what they do.'

35 And they divided his garments, and cast lots. And the people
stood and looked on. And the rulers scoffed, saying, 'He saved
others; let him save himself, if this is the Messiah of God, the
36 chosen one.' And the soldiers also mocked him, coming up to
37 him, and offering him vinegar, and saying, 'If thou art the king
38 of the Jews, save thyself.' And an inscription also was over him:
'This is the king of the Jews.'

39 And one of the criminals who had been hung up reviled him,
40 saying, 'Art not thou the Messiah? save thyself and us.' But
the other rebuked him, saying, 'Dost thou not even fear God,
41 seeing thou art suffering the same condemnation? And we in-
deed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but
42 this man has done nothing wrong.' And he said unto Jesus,
43 'Lord, remember me when thou comest with thy kingdom.' And
Jesus said unto him, 'Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou
be with me in paradise.'

34. This famous verse is wanting in the best MSS. and the S.S. and is almost universally acknowledged to be spurious. It somewhat awkwardly, moreover, interrupts the connection.

The prayer is a practical exemplification of vi. 28 at the supreme and most difficult moment. The same forgiving spirit is attributed, in Acts vii. 60, to the dying Stephen. (*Cp.* also Acts iii. 17, xiii. 27.)

If, then, the verse is not authentic, it shows that the noblest utterances in the Gospels need not necessarily be the most authentic. The argument—'Who could have invented this? only

Jesus could have said this; the reporter and editor were incapable of such nobility or originality'—breaks down in a critical instance. If, then, it breaks down here, it may well be of no compelling force elsewhere. If Mr Adeney's appeal for this verse, 'Nobody would have imagined or invented it,' is disregarded by almost all the great commentators, why should the similar appeal, which meets us so constantly for other passages, be regarded as of irrefragable force? The truth is that editors and disciples have also their moments of high appreciation and inspiration—a truth to which some of the finest passages in the Prophets also bear cogent witness.

Whom is Jesus asking God to forgive? The particular place of the insertion would suggest that the Roman soldiers and executioners are meant; the parallel in Acts vii. 60 might, however, lead us to suppose that he means the Jewish authorities, who have failed to recognize their Messiah, and therefore have acted in ignorance. Loisy thinks the latter, and would even include the Jewish people as a whole. The words attributed to Jesus are a fulfilment of Isaiah liii. 12, 'For the transgressors he made intercession' (*E. S.* II. p. 672).

Whether Jesus said the words does not after all matter very much. What does matter is that we have got them: here they are. Christianity, it is true, has disobeyed their letter and their spirit. Nevertheless, here they are, even though they have been so appallingly forgotten and violated. Their magnificence remains. The beauty of them must be recognized. If they have been usually disobeyed, they may sometimes have been remembered. It is better that they should be a household word than that they should be unknown. They are in line with the *best* teaching of the Old Testament: they are its culmination. Surely it can only do good that Jews should be familiar with them, even though much Jewish history is such a bitter and sarcastic commentary upon them. Jesus must not be made responsible for the age-continued wickedness of Christians, even as Jews must not be made responsible for a single Jewish crime.

35. Luke's narrative, here as elsewhere, has many peculiar traits. These are throughout attributed by B. Weiss to the source L, whose narrative Luke mainly follows with occasional insertions from Mark (xv. 37, 38). The presence of the people is emphasized. 'The chosen one' (ὁ ἐκλεκτός); *cp.* ix. 35 ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος.

36. Mark had not assigned a subject to 'they gave him wine with myrrh.' Yet it was possible to understand from his narrative the real course of events, namely, that it was not the soldiers who

had prepared, and who gave him (except as intermediaries) this wine, but the Jews, more particularly the Jewish women. Matthew, as we saw, while he does not make the subject definite, changes the purpose of the wine. Luke goes still further. He emphasizes that it was the soldiers who gave wine (ὄξος, sour wine), and that it was part of their mockery. He either anticipates and changes the incident given in Mark xv. 36, or he is (as here suggested) modifying Mark xv. 23, or perhaps he makes of the two incidents one. The inscription (38) Luke also regards as intentional insult and mockery.

37. Luke makes the soldiers repeat the mockery of the 'rulers.' The soldiers, who had not been mentioned as taking Jesus to Golgotha or as crucifying him, appear here as mocking watchers of the scene.

39-43. The two malefactors. Again, a special Lucan embroidery. Mark makes no difference between the two men—both insult Jesus. Luke's dramatic incident can lay no claim to being historical. Luke is fond of contrasted pairs. Both here and in one or two other details of the narrative, Luke shows parallelism with the 'Gospel of Peter.' All this section, according to B. Weiss, is from the special source, L.

40. Literally, 'because thou art in the same judgment.' The 'because' is a little awkward. Do the words mean, 'You do not even fear God which you surely should, seeing that you are suffering the same punishment as he'? (Holtzmann). Or, 'Do you not even fear God because you are suffering the same punishment as he? But you and I are suffering justly, whereas he is innocent' (W.). The second interpretation is better. That you are suffering the same punishment as he should not make you add to your sins by mocking God's anointed one. Have you not even enough fear of God to prevent this extra wickedness?

41. The criminal asserts his belief in Jesus's innocency and (42) in his Messiahship.

42. The better reading is 'in thy kingdom,' which means, according to W., 'with thy kingdom,' *i.e.* at the Parousia, at your reappearance to establish the Kingdom, 'on the day of your coming,' as the MS. D has it.

43. Jesus promises him even more than he asked. He shall not merely 'rise' and take part in the Kingdom, but he shall pass at once after death into paradise. Paradise must mean heaven,

the heavenly paradise. The commentators compare the phrase, 'Abraham's bosom,' used about Lazarus (xvi. 23). Thus, as J. Weiss says, here ('sehr bemerkenswerter Weise') it is assumed that Jesus, when he died, went at once to heaven. If this had been the prevailing view, and regarded as a dogma, the stories of the resurrection and ascension, as we have them now, could hardly have arisen. But it was only a concurrent and secondary idea; the predominating opinion was either that Jesus went down into Sheol (like everybody else), remained there a short time, and then 'arose' out of his grave, or that he stayed in the grave till he came forth from it.

44-49. The Death of Jesus

(*Cp.* Mark xv. 33-41; Matt. xxvii. 45-56)

44 And it was already about the sixth hour, and there was a
45 darkness over all the land until the ninth hour, for the sun was
in eclipse; and the curtain of the temple was rent down the
46 middle. And Jesus cried out with a loud voice, and said, 'Father,
into thy hands I commend my spirit': and having said this, he
expired.

47 Now when the centurion saw what had happened, he glorified
48 God, saying, 'Assuredly this man was innocent.' And all the crowds
who had come together for this spectacle, when they beheld what
49 happened, smote their breasts, and returned. And all his acquaintance, and the women who had followed him from Galilee,
stood at a distance afar off, looking upon these things.

45. The darkness is explained to be an eclipse of the sun; but it is not meant that this eclipse was not a miracle. Mark xv. 38 is transferred to this earlier stage. B. Weiss thinks that all 44 and all 45 except the first three words (τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος) are an insertion from Mark by Luke into the narrative of L.

46. Luke omits the cry of forsakenness. It was inconceivable to him. He substitutes for it another quotation from the Psalter, namely, xxxi. 5, than which nothing could be more appropriate. W., on the other hand, thinks that the quotation from Psalm xxxi. 5, which Jesus utters with a loud voice, is not a *substitute* for Mark's quotation from Psalm xxii., but a translation into words of the loud cry of Mark xv. 37, which immediately preceded the death. This seems less likely. If 46, without the 'loud cry,' is from L, the tradition may be independent.

47. The centurion's words are somewhat altered from Mark, or given from another tradition.

He saw what happened. In Luke's narrative this must refer to the sun's eclipse. The miracle shows that God regarded Jesus as innocent and was indignant at his death. Other commentators take 'what happened' (τὸ γενόμενον) to refer to his pious exclamation at death. This seems less likely.

Was what the centurion said—the acknowledgment that Jesus was a righteous man—the way in which he glorified God? B. Weiss thinks that he praised God for having proved by the miracle of the eclipse that Jesus was innocent. He praised God *and* said, &c. The modification which Luke makes in the centurion's words, as we find them in Mark, is commonly supposed either to be due to a feeling that it was not natural for a heathen to have said 'Son of God,' or to a wish to add one more testimony to Jesus's innocence. 'La préoccupation de l'apologiste a dominé celle du théologien' (*E. S.* II. p. 693). If the verse, as B. Weiss holds, is from L, then the words are the product of an independent tradition, and their form ('this man is surely righteous' or 'innocent') might be regarded as simpler and older than Mark's wording, 'This man is a Son of God.'

48. Luke only. As in 27 and 35, the 'people' are supposed to be present. They too are appalled by the miracle, and repent their share in the dread drama they have witnessed.

It was an unlikely refinement if B. Weiss made the plural (τὰ γενόμενα) in 48, as contrasted with the singular (τὸ γενόμενον) in 47, refer to the holy and resigned death of Jesus as well as to the eclipse. This interpretation has now been modified by him. He now supposes τὰ γενόμενα to allude to the two miracles (darkness and the rent curtain). The words from ἐπί to γενόμενα in 48 are, he now holds, an editorial insertion into L's text. W. says of the attitude of the crowd, 'Ihre sympathische Haltung fällt sehr auf.' The S.S. reads: 'And they said, Woe to us, what has happened to us, woe to us, because of our sins.' They are afraid of the consequences of their action. These words follow, 'beating their breasts.' The word ὑπέστρεφον is not included. It is not quite easy to say what ὑπέστρεφον means. Does it mean, 'they became repentant'? Probably. But according to B. Weiss the people have been on Jesus's side all along. Hence they do not need ὑποστρέφειν, to show 'return' or 'repentance.' Yet, he does not object to this word, though he does object to 'who had come together for this spectacle, when they beheld what happened.' These words are an insertion, for the people had not come as to a spectacle. But in that case why ὑπέστρεφον, which does seem to imply a change of mood?

49. Luke makes an important deviation from the corresponding passage in Mark. The second Evangelist had stated that women friends of Jesus witnessed the crucifixion from afar: he implied that no men friends of Jesus were present. But Luke says that all the acquaintances (γνωστοί) of Jesus were present, and in them he probably included the Eleven. We have already seen how he had omitted Mark xiv. 50. It is extremely doubtful whether Luke's statement has any historical foundation. It is very unlikely that if it had, Mark should have been so ignorant of it, and that even Luke in verse 55 &c. should have ignored it. Why should not men as well as women have watched the burial? More probably the addition of the γνωστοί is due to the tempting fulfilment which such an addition brought about with two well-known passages in the Psalter, xxxviii. 12, lxxxviii. 9 (Septuagint version). Perhaps too, with Loisy, we may see in the addition of the 'acquaintances,' 'un trait symbolique, comme le deuil universel dont l'évangéliste vient de parler' (*E. S.* II. p. 698). B. Weiss is ingenious. He supposes that all that stood in L was: 'All his friends stood, watching these things.' The words 'from afar' (ἀπὸ μακρόθεν), and the Galilæan women (who in L only appear in 55), are added by Luke from Mark. Thus the parallelism with the Psalms passages is cleverly got rid of. It is quaint to read: 'Die Quelle liebt es, in dieser Weise auf die hinzuweisen, von denen ihre Kunde dessen, was sie erzählte, stammt' (*Quellen*, B, p. 163). I fear more critical scholars will not share this touching belief in the accuracy of Luke's statements.

50–56. THE BURIAL OF JESUS

(*Cp.* Mark xv. 42–47; Matt. xxvii. 57–61)

50 And, behold, there was a man named Joseph, a councillor;
51 and he was a good and just man, and he had not agreed with
their resolve and deed. He was from Arimathæa, a city of the
52 Jews, and was himself waiting for the kingdom of God. This
53 man went to Pilate, and asked for the body of Jesus. And he
took it down, and wrapped it in fine linen, and laid it in a
sepulchre which was hewn out of stone, wherein no man was
54 laid before. And it was the day of preparation, and the sabbath
55 was beginning. And the women also, who had come with him
from Galilee, followed after, and they looked at the sepulchre, and
56 how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices
and ointments; and they rested on the sabbath day according to
the commandment.

51. To Mark's information about Joseph, Luke adds that he had not voted or agreed with his colleagues on the Sanhedrin in the condemnation of Jesus. (*Cp.* notes on Mark xv. 42.)

52. Pilate's assent to the request is omitted.

53. The tomb was new, says Matthew; no corpse had yet been placed in it, says Luke. (*Cp.* the ass on which no one had yet ridden.) A μνῆμα λαξευτόν does not seem quite the same as a tomb hewn in the rock. It seems rather to mean a tomb made of hewn stones.

54. What Mark stated before (xv. 42) is here added to by Luke. The day was Friday, and the Sabbath had begun. To B. Weiss almost all in this section is from the Jewish-Christian source L. It was sunset when the body of Jesus was put in the grave. ἐπέφωσκε is an odd word to use here: it means literally 'to begin to dawn.' It is employed here in a special sense, to indicate the opening of the Sabbath, when the Sabbath lights were kindled. Lake thinks there is no evidence that ἐπιφωσκεῖν could be used in this way. He thinks that Luke forgot the 'Jewish time reckoning and thought that, according to the law, Joseph and the women had the whole of Friday evening and night at their disposal,...that the women prepared the spices during the night before the Sabbath and came to the tomb as soon as the Sabbath was over—that is to say, on the dawn of the Sunday' (Lake, p. 59). Merx, on the other hand, supposes that the expression is a Greek equivalent—as good as could be got—for a technical Aramaic and Jewish term. 'Der völlig jüdische Ausdruck des Lukas muss der Urquelle entstammen.' If so, this 'Urquelle' was perhaps B. Weiss's L.

Merx supposes that if Jesus died at 3, and the Sabbath began at 6, there was time for Joseph's visit to Pilate, for the detachment from the cross, for the interment, and for the purchase of the spices all in the three hours. The Sabbath was just 'about to begin' at the interment, but there was still just time for the purchase of the spices. This seems somewhat doubtful.

55. The women who had watched the crucifixion remained at their post even after Jesus died. They saw how the body was removed by Joseph; they followed; and finally they saw how the body was deposited in the tomb. Luke is clearer than Mark or Matthew at this point.

56. The first part of the verse is not in strict accordance with the second; for the purchase of myrrh and spices was itself a

violation of the Sabbath. According to Mark xvi. 1, the purchase was only made after sunset on Saturday. Even if the 'preparation' of the spices does not mean 'purchase'—even if we suppose that the women possessed them in adequate quantity, and simply got them ready for use—such a 'preparation' would probably be against the Sabbath law. Has the narrator forgotten that he had said that the Sabbath had begun?

CHAPTER XXIV

1–12. The Empty Grave

(*Cp.* Mark xvi. 1–8; Matt. xxviii. 1–10)

1 Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning,
they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had
2 prepared, and they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre.
3 But having entered in, they found not the body of the Lord Jesus.
4 And it came to pass, while they were perplexed about this, behold,
5 two men stood by them in shining raiment. And when they were
afraid, and bent down their faces to the ground, they said unto
6 them, 'Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here,
but is risen: remember how he spoke unto you while he was yet
7 in Galilee, saying that the Son of man must be delivered up into
the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise
8, 9 again.' And they remembered his words, and they returned from
the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all
10 the rest. (It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the
mother of James, and the other women that were with them, who
11 told these things to the apostles.) And these words seemed to
them as idle talk, and they believed them not.

1. The women arrive very early, when dawn is just breaking. Thus Jesus has risen before sunrise. According to Loisy the object of this is to show that no one could have come to remove the body since the Sabbath. B. Weiss assigns all this section to L, except 2 and 11 which are editorial. Loisy will only allow that the section may have been suggested by a special source, but the redaction is all the Evangelist's (*E. S.* I. p. 164).

4. In this verse Mark's one angel has become two. They are like 'men,' not youths.

5. Thus Luke indicates that there ought to have been no doubt about the resurrection. Jesus had predicted it. The living Saviour, whom death could not capture, should not be sought among the dead. 'Une belle pensée,' says Loisy, but under the circumstances, 'trop raffinée.'

7. Luke changes at this point, because his theory is that the disciples did not return to Galilee, but remained in the capital, and there saw the risen Master. Hence the angels refer to the general predictions of his resurrection, but say nothing of its locality being fixed for Galilee. Galilee is only mentioned as the place where the *predictions* of the resurrection were uttered. But Galilee as the *locality* of the resurrection most probably preceded Jerusalem. It is hard to see how the second tradition should have preceded the first. On the contrary. The Jerusalem tradition is a deliberate correction of the other for special purposes. 'S'il y a une tradition qui tienne de l'histoire, c'est la tradition galiléenne; s'il y a une tradition profondément influencée par une intention apologétique, c'est la tradition hiérosolymitaine de Luc, développée par Jean' (*E. S.* II. p. 729). Not only was it desirable to deny the flight of the apostles to Galilee, but it was also desirable to make the apparitions of the Risen One begin as soon after the burial as possible. This desire we already see gratified in Matthew (xxviii. 9).

9. Luke agrees with Matthew, and contradicts Mark. The women tell their story to the apostles.

10. This verse is, as W. thinks, probably interpolated. It is awkward and unnecessary, and ends by repeating 9. For Joanna, see viii. 3. In any case, Luke probably wished the reader to understand that the visitants at the tomb were more than two or three.

11. The disciples do not believe the story. What the women say seems nonsense (λῆρος) to them. Their subsequent faith depended altogether upon visible and tangible proof. But the primal doubt remains a fixed element in the tradition,—by Luke used to show the force of the proofs which extinguished it. (*Cp. E. S.* II. p. 731.) In a probably spurious verse (12) an interpolator attempted to harmonize Luke's narrative with John xx. 4. Moreover, the interpolation was an answer to the obvious question: 'Why did none of the apostles go and see for themselves?' Well, Peter did! In xxiv. 24 we are told another story. Several of the disciples went to see the tomb. Merx, ingeniously and learnedly, essays to show that verse 12 ('But Peter arose, and ran unto the

tomb; and stooping and looking in, he saw the linen clothes by themselves, and departed, wondering at that which had happened') is genuine, but that 34 is interpolated. It would take too long to give even a summary of the reasons upon which this opinion is based.

Spitta has an ingenious theory about Luke's general conception of the resurrection. This theory continues and emphasizes his general conception and hypothesis about the relation of Luke to the supposed 'apostolische Grundschrift.'

According to Spitta, verses 4–8 are insertions by Luke into the original story of the empty grave in the 'Grundschrift.' This insertion is made with the help of, and on the basis of, Mark and Matthew, though arranged also to suit the theory that the risen Jesus appeared, at least first of all, in Jerusalem.

There was, Spitta holds, no angel at the tomb in the original story in the 'Grundschrift.'

His next point is that Matt. xxviii. 9, which relates how the risen Jesus appeared to the women, is not a sheer addition of Matthew's. It corresponds, at least in part, with what we may conjecture to have stood in the lost conclusion of Mark. For Mark did not end with the abrupt 'for they were afraid' of xvi. 8. On the contrary, Mark told how Jesus met the women, removed their fear, and induced them to report to the apostles what they had seen and heard. Thus Mark, as well as Matthew, witnesses to the risen Jesus having manifested himself first of all in Judæa, and not in Galilee.

Thirdly, Spitta presses Mark xiv. 28. This verse, together with 27 *b*, has been taken from another connection, but is older than xvi. 7. And what does it mean? Not what W. and others, led by their wishes, and led by the theory that the resurrection story is easiest to explain if Jesus first seemed to appear to the disciples in Galilee—the vision hypothesis—want and suppose it to mean. It does not mean that Jesus will rise and go by himself into Galilee, and there appear to the apostles. It does not mean that the risen Jesus is to be seen by nobody till he is seen in Galilee; but it means that Jesus will rise, and himself lead his apostles back to Galilee. *Cp.* Mark x. 32, *ἦν προάγων αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς*, 'Jesus led them on the way.' This conception of the resurrection was modified both in Mark xvi. 7 and in Matt. xxviii. 7, 10. For there we are told, not that Jesus will lead the disciples to Galilee, but that he will be seen there by them. [*προάγει* one must assume is there used in the loose sense which it must not have in Mark xiv. 28.] Thus Mark does not contradict the main idea of the 'Grundschrift,' that the risen Jesus first appeared in or near Jerusalem (*Streitfragen der Geschichte Jesu*, pp. 69–81).

The arguments, of which only the conclusions are given here, are decidedly ingenious. But I doubt whether they will hold water. For one thing, how did a statement like that in Mark xiv. 28 (on Spitta's interpretation) grow up, how was it ever made, if it was never supposed to have been realized? But there is no story of Jesus leading the apostles back to Galilee after his resurrection. And the double sense in which προάγειν has to be used in Mark xiv. 28 and xvi. 7 creates a difficulty. Still it might be said that in xvi. 7 the author is merely quoting, and thus uses old words to which he gives a new sense. And there is no doubt that 'I will *lead* you *to* Galilee' is an odd way of saying 'I will *meet* you *in* Galilee.'

13–35. THE APPEARANCE AT EMMAUS

(Luke only)

13 And, behold, two of them went that same day to a village
14 called Emmaus, which was sixty furlongs from Jerusalem. And
15 they talked together about all these events. And it came to pass, that, while they talked together and argued, Jesus himself came
16 near, and walked with them. But their eyes were held fast, so that they did not know him.

17 And he said unto them, 'What are these discussions which ye are holding with one another, as ye walk?' And they stood still,
18 looking sad. And one of them, whose name was Cleopas, answered and said unto him, 'Art thou the only pilgrim in Jerusalem, who does not know the things which have happened therein during
19 these days?' And he said unto them, 'What things?' And they said unto him, 'About Jesus of Nazareth, who was a prophet
20 mighty in deed and word before God and all the people: and how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him up to be condemned
21 to death, and crucified him. But we hoped that it was he who was to redeem Israel. And, moreover, besides all this, it is now
22 the third day since these things took place. Yet certain women of our company have amazed us, for they went at dawn to the
23 sepulchre, and did not find his body, and came to us, saying, that they had also seen a vision of angels, who said that he was alive.
24 And some of our number went to the sepulchre, and found it even so as the women had said: but him they did not see.'

25 Then he said unto them, ‘O senseless, and slow of heart to
26 believe all that the prophets have spoken: had not the Messiah
27 to suffer these things, and so to enter into his glory?’ And beginning
with Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto
28 them what is said in all the scriptures about himself. And they
drew nigh unto the village, whither they were going; and he made
29 as though he was going on further. But they pressed him, saying,
‘Remain with us: for it is toward evening, and the day is already
30 far spent.’ And he went in to stay with them. And it came to
pass, as he sat at table with them, he took bread, and spoke the
31 blessing, and broke it and gave it to them. And their eyes were
opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight.

32 And they said one to another, ‘Did not our heart burn within
us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us
33 the scriptures?’ And they rose up the same hour, and returned
to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them
34 that were with them, who said to them, ‘The Lord has verily risen
35 and has appeared to Simon.’ Then they, in their turn, told what
had happened on the way, and how he became known to them in
the breaking of the bread.

This story is peculiar to Luke. Some think that it was specially invented by him, and inserted in its present place after the rest of the chapter had been composed. It is argued that 36 fits well on to 11. To B. Weiss, however, the whole section is from L.

13. The two disciples are not two of the eleven apostles. They belong to the ‘others’ mentioned in verse 9.

The village is usually identified with a place called by Josephus Ammaus, where Vespasian settled some of his soldiers. Hence the place was called Kolonia, and to-day it still bears that name (Kolonije). It is 45 ‘stadia’ (5 miles), not 60 ‘stadia’ (7 miles), from Jerusalem.

16. They recognize neither voice nor form. Their ears as well as their eyes are supernaturally dulled.

18. *παροικεῖς*. Jesus is taken to be a passing stranger or pilgrim. Even so, it is strange that he should not know what has occurred.

19. The description of Jesus is noteworthy. He is still spoken

of as a man, and not yet as God, or even as a demi-God. And he is best characterized as a Prophet.

21. They had hoped that he was the Messiah, but his death had proved that this hope was an error. The Greek in the second half of the verse is hard, but the meaning must be that which is given in the translation. The Jewish form of the Christian hope is very striking in this verse. One hardly expects it here.

22. W. thinks that 22–24 are a later interpolation. J. Weiss would only excise 24. Loisy would keep the whole. This tradition seems independent of the story in John and of Luke xxiv. 12.

25. Jesus proceeds to prove to them that the death of the Messiah was predicted in Scripture. His death was the condition precedent of his 'glory.'

26. J. Weiss says that the words almost sound as if Jesus had already entered into his glory. Is it the same conception that we found in xxiii. 42, 43, namely, that Jesus passed straight from the cross to heaven? Is 'heaven' the 'glory'? This seems to be the meaning. Jesus entered upon his glory when he ascended into heaven and sat down at the right hand of the Father. An older view would be that the glory is the glory of the Kingdom, the glory of the Coming (the Parousia). Jesus would redeem Israel by and at the Parousia. (The still later conception, that his death was itself redemptive, is here ignored. So, too, in xxi. 28.)

27. 'Beginning with Moses and all the prophets.' An awkward construction. The Prophets are added to Moses by a zeugma. Moses and Prophets are made to stand for the Bible as a whole and to include the Psalms. A frequent work of early Christianity is, as it were, anticipated in this sentence, when the Scriptures had to be searched and searched again for proofs of the faith and for arguments against the Jews (*E. S.* II. p. 762).

29. It is odd to find in this beautiful tale a verbal reminiscence of the ugly story in Judges xix. 9.

30. Jesus resumes his old part and habit. He plays the host, not the guest. There is no definite allusion to the Last Supper; only to the common meals, which were such a marked feature of the old life. Yet the memory of the Supper may have been present to the mind of the narrator.

31. Jesus is half 'material,' half 'spiritual.' He disappears mysteriously, but there is nothing 'ghostly' about his form and look.

34. Even if the Emmaus narrative was composed by Luke, he may have embodied in it current traditions. In this verse he casually introduces a totally fresh story, namely, that Jesus had appeared to Peter. The greatest stress is usually placed upon the statement in this verse, isolated as it is, because it confirms the statement in 1 Cor. xv. 5. The prevailing view is that the Epistle to the Corinthians was really written by Paul, and that chapter xv. is therefore the oldest extant tradition about the resurrection appearances. The brief dry statement, 'he appeared to Peter,' seems to most critics worthy of belief. It is often thought that (apart from Paul) the whole conception and story of the resurrection started from a vision which was experienced by Peter. When once one man fancied that he had 'seen' the risen Master, the report of the vision would act contagiously.

Why, says Loisy, is Peter's vision of the risen Jesus not described? We cannot say that the reason is because Luke knew of it only from the account in the Corinthians. For Luke entirely neglects the statements of Paul about the resurrection visions (*cp. E. S.* II. p. 744). Moreover the vision to Peter of which Paul speaks must have happened in Galilee, like the resurrection visions presupposed or foreshadowed in Mark. Therefore one must suppose that the vision to Peter was described in the source from which Luke drew his Emmaus story, though Luke did not include that portion of the narrative.

There is another explanation of doubtful value. It appears that Origen in more places than one names the two disciples Cleophas and Simon. Was this perhaps original? Combine it with the fact that in verse 34 the MS. D reads λεγόντες, not λεγόντας. Note too that the construction in the received text of 34 is very awkward. The participle λεγόντας follows on clumsily. So too the first two words in 35, *καὶ αὐτοί*, are awkward also. Hence it has been supposed that it was the two disciples Peter and Cleophas who said to the others that Jesus had risen and had appeared to Peter, for whom, one has to assume, the apparition is mainly intended. If it were Peter who had the vision at Emmaus, Luke would have used the story to replace the Galilæan appearance to Peter of which we hear in John xxi. The rest of the story of that Galilæan appearance he may have used in his own account of the miraculous draught of fishes in v. 6. The original text may from one or other of many motives have been modified to that which we now read. Perhaps the words 'he appeared to Simon' were, as is not unnatural, misunderstood. For it should have been said, 'he appeared to us two.'

However all this may be, Loisy contends that the Emmaus apparition is secondary and symbolic. The breaking of the bread in

30 shows the relation which originally existed between the faith in the resurrection and the eucharistic meals. Faith in the presence of Christ in the midst of his disciples, faith in his resurrection, were affirmed by one and the same ceremony. Yet some supposed vision must lie behind. Jesus was seen breaking bread among his disciples. The Emmaus story is a recasting, with fresh scenery and details, of memories of the Galilæan apparitions (*E. S.* II. pp. 766–768).

One must admit that the Jewish character of much of the Emmaus section is a support to B. Weiss's theory that the section is taken from L. But the connecting links between the two apparitions of Jesus are due, in B. Weiss's opinion, to Luke. That is to say, L's portion of the Emmaus section stops at 32. Verses 33–35, and part of 36, are Luke's. To Weiss apparently the Emmaus story is historical. But the hour when Jesus disappeared (verse 31) was already far advanced. The disciples could not have returned that evening to Jerusalem. Moreover what is told them in 34 is in flagrant contradiction to the scepticism displayed in 37 and 41. The statement in 34 'kann nur von dem Paulusschüler herrühren, der die Auferstehung am dritten Tage so oft durch das ὤφθη Σίμωνι von seinem Meister verbürgen gehört hatte' (1 Cor. xv. 5) (*Quellen*, A, p. 232). Weiss's views are to some extent corroborated by Merx. For partly upon the basis of the S.S., and partly because 34 and 35 are inconsistent with the incredulity of 37, and partly for other reasons which I cannot attempt to summarize, Merx regards 34 as an interpolation. The oldest text ran, he thinks: 'and they returned to Jerusalem and found the eleven assembled together and those with them. And he (Jesus) appeared to them, [and said to them, Peace be unto you], and they were frightened,' &c. Certainly as the Greek now stands, 34 occupies a very awkward position.

36–53. The Appearance at Jerusalem

(Luke only)

36 And as they thus spoke, he himself stood in the midst of them,
37 [and said unto them, 'Peace be unto you.'] But they were scared
38 and frightened, and supposed that they saw a spirit. And he said
unto them, 'Why are ye agitated? and why do doubts arise in
39 your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself:
touch me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see
40 that I have.' [And when he had said this, he showed them his
41 hands and his feet.] And while they yet disbelieved for joy, and

42 wondered, he said unto them, 'Have ye any food here?' And
43 they gave him a piece of broiled fish. And he took it, and ate it
before them.

44 And he said unto them, 'These are the words which I spoke
unto you, while I was yet with you, that all must be fulfilled,
which is written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in
45 the psalms, concerning me.' Then opened he their mind to under-
46 stand the scriptures. And he said unto them, 'Thus it is written
that the Messiah should suffer, and that he should rise from the
47 dead the third day: and that repentance for forgiveness of sins
should be preached in his name unto all nations, beginning
48, 49 from Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things. And,
behold, I send out the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry
ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high.'

50 And he led them out as far as to Bethany, and he lifted up his
51 hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass, as he blessed them,
52 he was parted from them. And they returned to Jerusalem with
53 great joy, and were continually in the temple, praising God.

37. Doubtless the unbelief of the disciples would fit better with 11. It reads strangely after 34.

πνεῦμα. A spirit; a ghost (*cp.* 'apparition' in Mark vi. 49, where the Greek has *φάντασμα*). It would seem that the opponents of the resurrection argued that what the disciples saw might have been an appearance of Jesus from Hades. The popular notion doubtless was that when a man died his 'soul' went down to 'Sheol' or 'Hades.' Here he remained, in flimsy yet human shape, till the resurrection. Such a 'shade' might doubtless be able to show itself on occasion upon earth; he might be 'called up' magically; but if this was what the disciples saw, there would be nothing divine about it; it would not prove that Jesus had risen out of his grave, or that any special resurrection had taken place. Hence the tendency grew to insist upon the corporeality of the risen Jesus. He could not only be seen, but also heard; then he could be touched; he had flesh and bone; he could eat. On the other hand, he can pass in and out of closed doors. His flesh is not quite the old flesh; it is not subject to all the old laws. (Lake has an interesting view that Luke's materialism is due to anti-Docetic polemic) (p. 222).

It is not meant that the 'ghost' would have been a mere figment of their brains. It would have been a real 'spirit,' but the 'spirit' of a man was, somehow, not quite his real self.

39. Apparently this means that Jesus showed the marks upon his hands and feet of the nails by which he had been affixed to the cross. This is more fully brought out in John xx. 25–27.

43. He eats fish, and some MSS. add that he ate some honey. Both probably have some symbolic meaning. But the fish may be a relic of the Galilæan apparition stories. *Cp.* also John xxi. 6–13 (the miraculous draught of fishes). But only Luke makes Jesus eat. It is doubtful whether Paul or any of the apostles would ever have admitted that Jesus, after his rising, would have been able to partake, or would have partaken, of 'corruptible' mortal food, even though it were only to strengthen the faith of his disciples.

44. Jesus reminds them of what he had told them in his lifetime upon earth. The Scriptures must be fulfilled. Here we get the Psalms coupled with the Law and the Prophets: the allusions are to such Psalms as xxii., lxix., cx., &c.

45. He proceeds to expound the Scriptures, as in 27. The two narratives are perhaps parallel and independent.

47. The construction is not easy. Most commentators say that the order to preach is also contained in the Scriptures. ἀρξάμενοι ('beginning') in the nominative case is an irregularity. W. holds that the order to preach is not to be conceived as contained in the Scriptures. There is a new beginning. The infinitive, κηρυχθῆναι, stands for the imperative. This makes the nominative, ἀρξάμενοι, easier. But in that case, if W. is right, 'my name' must be read for 'his name,' which in fact the Sinaitic Syriac has.

The programme is universalistic. The new community is to convert all nations, including the Jews; and it is to start from Jerusalem. (*Cp.* Acts i. 8.) The faith in the resurrection founded the Catholic Church. The mission of the Church, as the Church conceived it at the close of the century, is put in the mouth of the risen Master. B. Weiss holds, not unreasonably, that 47 is an insertion (awkwardly constructed) by Luke. So too are 49 and 52 and 53 and part of 50. L's story ended thus: 'Ye are witnesses of these things. And lifting up his hands he blessed them. And it came to pass that as he blessed them he parted from them.' This certainly makes a good and dignified close.

48. They are witnesses of his death and resurrection: these 'things' which they themselves have witnessed, and to which they can testify, were already predicted in the Scriptures, and by faith in them men, repenting of their sins, will obtain forgiveness.

49. Luke points forward to the next stage, and to his next work—the Acts. In violation of, and contradiction to, the order given in Mark and Matthew, the disciples are to remain in Jerusalem. The Church is to be founded there. There they are to receive the Holy Spirit ('the power from on high') which Jesus will send to them. The promise (ἐπαγγελία) is perhaps an allusion to Joel iii. 1–5. (*Cp.* Acts i. 4, 8, ii. 1–21, 33.)

50. Jesus apparently takes the disciples through the streets of Jerusalem, and as far as Bethany. Was it night? Or does no one see him? Or was he invisible to all but the disciples? Probably the narrator did not think of these puzzles. If the section is independent of the Emmaus story, we need not suppose that the time was night. But, anyway, the 'ascension' (if 51 describes it) takes place upon the same day as the resurrection. According to Acts i. 3, the ascension did not take place till forty days after the resurrection. The varying forms of the legend need not concern us here. The original idea was doubtless that the risen Jesus ascended directly to heaven. It is the heavenly Jesus who then later on appears to the disciples in Galilee. The resurrection and ascension were 'two aspects of the same event.' Moreover it was a Jesus with a 'spiritual body' who appeared to Paul as to the disciples in Galilee. But it is possible that another story also grew up according to which Jesus rose with his flesh and blood unchanged; he could still eat and be touched; he had not yet ascended into heaven, and did not ascend thither until after his 'appearances,' and only then, at the ascension, was his body changed into the spiritual body of the heavenly Christ (see Lake, pp. 230–234).

51. Many good MSS. add the words, 'And he was carried up into heaven.' But others omit them, and so perhaps no 'ascension' was originally here intended. It is unnecessary in this book to discuss the relation of Luke's stories of the risen Jesus in his Gospel to his variant narrative in the first chapter of the Acts. This is done by Loisy, *E. S.* II. pp. 756–782, and in many other works.

53. The early church of Jerusalem, the first disciples in the city, were faithful lovers of the Temple. Their discipleship did not apparently make their visits to the Temple less frequent, but more so.

The notes upon the stories of the Passion and the resurrection have been meagre, not because these stories are not full of interest and fascination, but because, for the purposes of this book, it was unnecessary to discuss at any length or in detail the various problems which they raise. Neither the self-surrender at Gethsemane nor the death scene at Golgotha is without religious value and meaning to a Jewish reader. But such a one does not feel nearer, or more reconciled, to God because of the death of Jesus; he does not draw his faith in immortality from the resurrection of Jesus, even if that resurrection were more than a legend or a vision. Yet the time will surely come when the roll of Israel's prophets will be acknowledged by Jews themselves not to close before the prophet of Nazareth. Not Malachi but Jesus will be spoken of as 'the last of the prophets.' For here is his true spiritual kinship: he is of the same stuff and lineage as Amos, Hosea and Isaiah.

It may not be possible to prove with any certainty whether Jesus himself intended to found a new religion. The probability is that he had no such intention. Like the prophets of old he felt and believed himself sent to the house of Israel to prepare them for the coming Judgment. But like the prophets too, he not only announced the Judgment, but he summoned to repentance. He was not always engaged in thinking of and talking about the Judgment, though he believed that it was at hand. He was also the teacher of religion generally—the teacher, the consoler, the friend. Since the days of Isaiah religion had become much more individualized, and thus Jesus, in this like Ezekiel, spoke to the few and to the individual, as well as to the many. He was not always the prophet of doom and repentance: he was also the *Seelsorger*; the saver of souls, the shepherd. And the great and novel feature about this shepherd is that he seeks his flock among the erring, the lost, the disconsolate. These he will save in the Judgment, and prepare for the Kingdom. In some ways, though he is as vehement in denunciation as Jeremiah, he is less sweeping and more hopeful. He does not leave the future merely to God. He does not merely predict that, in the future, in the Kingdom which is to come, men will know God truly; he seeks by his own care and influence and love, by his example and his teaching, to make them know God truly now. He seeks to save and to redeem.

His teaching is cast in a finely prophetic mould. It takes its inspiration from the prophets rather than from the Pentateuch. And yet the highest teaching of the Pentateuch, based as it is upon the teaching of the prophets, is also the teaching of Jesus. 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God, the Lord is One. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' What Jesus has to say is mainly based upon these words.

Modern Judaism needs both the Rabbis and Jesus. It can, as it were, absorb them both. Both are bone of the Jewish bone and spirit of its spirit. The teaching of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels could not suffice for a new religion. A religion needs body as well as spirit. Hence Christianity had to create a quantity of dogmas, of ceremonies, of institutions, many of which were in antagonism to the teaching of its founder. Modern Judaism can combine what is best and truest in the two strands: in the prophetic, inward teaching of Isaiah and of Jesus; in the institutional, outward system of the Pentateuch and the Rabbis. For the second was itself based upon the first, and included considerable portions of it, while it also needs the first as its perpetual corrective and limitation. Rightly regarded, the two are not antagonistic, but complementary. If modern Judaism may rightly claim Isaiah as one of its founders, it may also claim Jesus. He too is ours.

APPENDIX

INTRODUCTION. § 10.—I am glad to see that Otto Pfleiderer in a long and interesting review of B. Weiss, Quellen, A, in the *Protestantische Monatshefte*, Vol. XI. (1907), while accepting the theory that Mark knew Q, yet strongly held that Q went through much expansion and addition. It was a comparatively little Q which Mark employed. The Q of Matthew is later than 70 A.D. Pfleiderer (as against Harnack) defended Wellhausen's view of Matt. xxiii. 35, and rejected the authenticity of Matt. xi. 25–27 (*Die neueste Evangelienkritik*, pp. 117–139).

MARK I. 10.—The translation should have read 'descended *into* him.' And thus by actually getting the spirit inside him, he became the Son of God.

I. 26.—'The agreement of the form of the quotation with that in Matt. xi. 10 and Luke vii. 27 and that, too, precisely in those particulars in which Matthew and Luke depart from the Hebrew original and the Septuagint version, together with the improbability that if Matthew and Luke derived this quotation from Mark rather than the converse they would have agreed in inserting the quotation at precisely the same point in their respective narratives, creates a possibility that Mark is at this point secondary to Matthew and Luke or to the document from which Matthew and Luke derived their narrative of the message from John the Baptist' (Burton, *Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem*, p. 25).

II. 10.—Bacon independently agrees with Loisy as to the interpolation of 5 *b*–10. But he seems dependent upon Weber and the other Protestant scholars for his knowledge of Rabbinic theology. It is false that the Rabbis held that a sinner could not be forgiven by God 'until he had achieved merit by works of the law.' Repentance was enough to produce immediate forgiveness.

II. 21, 22.—Bacon's note shows the difficulty: 'This pair of proverbial sayings (parables?) might well be authentic, though not found in Q. They well express the sweeping radicalism of this gospel against Jewish observances (*cf.* vii. 3–7, 15; x. 1–12, 20, 21; xii. 33); but when applied, as here, to Jesus' conduct generally, as compared with the Pharisees and disciples of John, they go beyond the historical probability (*cf.* Rom. xv. 8). To Mark and his readers they answer the question, Why do not Christians retain the Jewish observances? The answer given is, Christians are a different race, filled with a new spirit, and require to form their own. Their original application is more doubtful' (p. 30).

IV. 5.—Bacon observes that the point of the original parable of the sower is: 'the farmer is not discouraged because part of his seed goes to waste. The moral of the allegorical explanation is: Do you, hearers of the word, take heed not to let it remain unfruitful' (p. 49).

VII. 3.—It is pleasant to find Prof. Bacon saying that the redactor is 'either ill-informed or prejudiced or both. Such narrow ceremonialism was far from characterizing "all the Jews" or even the best of the "Pharisees." The statement better deserves the name of a travesty or caricature, applying at best to the narrowest circles of synagogue orthodoxy' (p. 86).

VII. 14–23.—Bacon's note is interesting: 'The entire paragraph is an elaboration of the single saying (ver. 15), which is indeed capable of very sweeping application, but cannot have been understood by the Twelve as intended to abolish the Mosaic distinctions of meats. The Semite knows no comparative degree. Hence to express the thought: Inward (spiritual) purity is more pleasing to God than abstinence from prescribed meats (*cp.* Matt. v. 8), the natural mode of expression is as in verse 15. In substance at least it is a parallel to the Q saying on cleansing the inside (Luke, of the *man*; Matthew, of the *dish*) rather than the outside (Matt. xxiii. 25, 26 = Luke xi. 39–41). R is more radical than the saying or practice of Jesus really warrants, in declaring that by this utterance he abolished all the Mosaic distinctions of meats' (p. 88).

VII. 28.—I am inclined to think that Prof. Bacon would know too much when he says: 'The vital feature apparent from comparison of Matthew and Mark is that the woman's answer, humble yet full of faith, was received by Jesus as an enlargement of his own point of view. The finding of faith in this unexpected quarter was to him an intimation from the Father (*cp.* Matt. xvi. 17), opening his eyes to a wider extension of his mission' (p. 90).

VIII. 27.—As against Wellhausen's suggestions that the section viii. 27–x. reflects a later theology and date it is well to read two long articles by Holtzmann, one in the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Vol. x. (1906), 'Die Marcus Controverse in ihrer heutigen Gestalt' (a most learned and instructive survey), and the other in the *Protestantische Monatshefte*, Vol. x. (1906), 'Wellhausen's Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien und die moderne Theologie.' In both articles Holtzmann points out that we must not exaggerate. The section in Mark viii. 37–x. contains incidents with such markedly historical character as those of the epileptic child (ix. 14–29), the quarrel about precedence (ix. 33–37), the strange exorcist (ix. 38–40), the lesson on divorce (x. 1–12), the danger of wealth (x. 17–27), and the regret of the sons of Zebedee (x. 35–45). And the veteran commentator, who seems to have read everything that has ever been written about the Gospels, adds: 'Die von Wellhausen mit Recht betonte Neuheit technischer Ausdrücke und Begriffe in jenem christlich messianischen Abschnitt wird ihre naturgemässe Ursache mindestens zum guten Teil in der grossen Wendung finden, die in der Situation Jesu und seiner Jünger um die Zeit des Petrusbekenntnisses wirklich eingetreten war, und noch in dem Rückblick des sicher schon alten, aber nur in unsichersten Rahmen erhaltenen Wortes Lukas xxii. 35, 36 nachwirkt' (*Prot. Monatshefte*, p. 218).

VIII. 29.—One more of the numerous efforts to combine the admission that Jesus did claim to be the Messiah with the usual keen desire that there should be nothing 'theocratic,' 'outward,' 'political' about his conception of the Messiahship can be read in Bacon, p. 107 *seq.* It is about as probable, or perhaps I should rather say, about as improbable, as all the others, and it rests moreover on dubious statements as to the growth and nature of the Messianic idea. If Jesus regarded himself as the Messiah, why should he not also have supposed that he would 'reign' over a regenerate Israel as the deputy of God? If king and subjects are all righteous and pure, what is there evil in the relationship, even though it is also 'political,' 'outward,' 'theocratic'? What Jesus thought would be the relation of Israel to the Gentile world in the Messianic Kingdom we have no means for determining. It is safe to say that he was no eager nationalist, and had no desire for Israel's supremacy or for its vengeance over its national foes, but it is going too far to suppose that he did not conceive the new era as a 'theocratic' kingdom, with himself as its divinely appointed king.

IX. 13.—This verse, as Prof. Bacon suggests, implies the existence, even at that early date, of a form of the legend of

Elijah in which he is slain and then rises from the dead. *Cp.* Rev. xi. 'Our only trace of this prediction is in a Jewish apocalyptic legend preserved in the Slavonic under the pseudonym of the book of *Biblical Antiquities* of Philo, wherein the reappearance *and martyrdom* of Elijah are related in a manner showing connection with the legend of Rev. xi. 7–13' (p. 126).

IX. 31.—*Cp.* Loisy (*E. S.* I. p. 177). The feature of the third day 'was not in all probability taken from the Bible, but from the popular idea according to which the body and the soul of a dead person are definitely separated from each other at the end of three days. After this interval the resurrection would have been inconceivable; before it the actual death might have seemed doubtful. Faith in the resurrection of Jesus did not become assured till some time after his death, and it is probable that not a single one of his disciples had the least idea of it three days after the crucifixion. But it is easy to perceive that the first need for the acquired belief in the resurrection was to fix the time when Jesus had ceased to be dead and had become immortal. The number of three days imposed itself of necessity, but tradition seems to have hesitated for some while as to how the number was to be applied. Was it after being dead three days or on the third day after his death that Jesus returned to life? According to the first hypothesis, the story of Jonah and the whale could be regarded as a typological prophecy of that which God was going to do for the Messiah. According to the second, a passage from Hosea (vi. 1) offered a basis for argument. The fixing of Sunday, the second day after the death, as the day of the resurrection does not seem to have its origin either in a traditional reminiscence or in a biblical text, but in the custom which, from very early times, used the first day of the week as the day for Christian reunions and the day of the Messiah. This custom itself took its use, not perhaps only from the fact that the first believers were induced to choose for their meetings the first free day after the Sabbath, but from the fact that the day of the Sun became as it were quite naturally the day of the Saviour for those Christians who had just come over from paganism. Thus may be explained the singular anomaly of the Gospel narratives declaring that Jesus rose on the *second* day after his death, and yet wishing to find therein the fulfilment of predictions which placed the resurrection at the end of three days.'

IX. 48.—Is not the wish the father to the word when Prof. Bacon declares that 'Jesus leaves the whole question of the fate of the wicked absolutely open, beyond the simple warning that it is better to incur any fate than that of the divine retribution against the cowardly and insincere'? (p. 136).

X. 15.—Bacon's note is worth adding: 'It is the humble position—not disposition—of a child which forms the point of comparison; *cp.* Matt. xviii. 2–4 (Q ?). Children are not more humble than other people, but what they receive comes to them from grace and not as earned, or by enforcible right. This saying is better adapted to the context of ix. 33–35 on rank and reward in the Kingdom' (p. 140).

X. 19.—It may be questioned whether Prof. Bacon does not press the difference between Mark and Matthew too far For 'thou knowest the commandments' Matthew (xix. 17) has the imperative, 'keep the commandments.' 'Could anything,' says Bacon, 'more flatly contradict both spirit and letter of the original? Mark has the definite, distinct declaration that the keeping of these commandments *leaves lacking* the essential thing, which is —the doctrine of the cross, life through death, the world to come by surrender of this world. And Matthew, by the alteration of a phrase or two, states the contrary. Eternal life is the reward of keeping the commandments' (p. 132). Wellhausen's commentary seems more temperate here. Nor can I see that the 'one thing thou lackest' is equivalent to 'self-surrender by faith' as opposed to 'works of the law.' Prof. Bacon would perhaps hold that a morality and religion which honestly preach salvation by means of works of the law are a poor morality and a poor religion; and yet no religion and no morality have produced a higher percentage of saintly lives and martyrs than these. 'On that essential issue the Gospel of Mark here shows itself no less squarely Pauline than on the practical one of the Mosaic distinctions.' I gather, however, that though in both these cases 'squarely Pauline,' it is also authentic. Can we have it both ways?

XII. 14.—I observe this note in Bacon. 'Jesus himself and the Church afterwards on all political questions were strictly Pharisean, they confined their efforts to the practice of righteousness, leaving to God the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom in his own time and in his own way' (p. 170). Quite so. What then was the huge difference between Jesus's conception of the Messiah and that of the Pharisees? Was not the second less crudely 'political,' the first less immaterially 'spiritual' than is usually supposed? And have we not to remember Prof. Bacon's useful warning that 'records written when Christians were concentrating every effort to prove the political inoffensiveness of their faith...must be subject to discount'? And this effort began much before the era of the fourth Gospel.

XIV. 1.—Bacon's remarks here are very interesting: 'Not since the opening scenes of the ministry beside the boats on the lake shore near Capernaum have we met scenes so lifelike and realistic as confront us in this crowning element of the Petrine tradition, the story of the night in which Jesus was betrayed. Not even the scenes about Peter's house in Capernaum are so realistic as those now presented in the garden of Gethsemane and the courtyard of the high priest's house, where Peter sits in the light of the fire kindled by the servants "because of the cold." The agony under the olive trees is a trait whose human pathos has remained indestructible through all the centuries of scholastic application, like the first vigil of prayer in the solitude outside Capernaum. And once more Peter comes to the fore. Next to the figure of Jesus it is that of Peter round which the whole scene revolves...So soon as Peter has fled from the scene, all becomes relatively vague and shadowy. For the story of the Trial before Pilate, and the incidents of the crucifixion we could be sure of the main facts independently of any of the Twelve. But the story does not go beyond just these main facts. The figure of Simon of Cyrene is indeed an exception, and seems to be introduced for the very purpose of presenting a sponsor for the tradition, but the traits which seem at first to indicate some direct connection with eyewitnesses of the scene, the draught of wine, parting of garments, dying utterance, turn out upon closer scrutiny to be elaborations of "fulfilled scriptures" rather than authentic tradition.

'As the story closes with a message to Peter and the disciples that Jesus will go before them into Galilee, it is apparent that the next scene, if we had it, would have again brought Peter into the foreground, and in Galilee, whence it would be needful to bring him as well as the rest of the scattered flock to Jerusalem, which certainly was to every evangelist the original seat of the Church.

'It is true that the conclusion as we now have it presupposes that the disciples have not scattered, but are together in the vicinity of Jerusalem, whence they must be *sent* to Galilee by means of a message from the angel reminding them of the appointment. This, however, cannot be original. Why must they go to Galilee before Jesus can reveal himself to them, only to be at once brought back again? Later tradition feels this objection and therefore cancels the Galilean episode altogether. In reality the first appearance *was* in Galilee, and had to be there *because the disciples had fled thither.* This trait of flight and desertion cannot have been invented, and is the only possible explanation of the surviving traditions of appearances in Galilee. We may be certain that the ancient Petrine tradition coincided with Paul's summary of the appearances, beginning with that to Peter, and justified the prayer of Jesus for Simon's restoration that he might rally his brethren' (pp. 190–191).

XIV. 55.—Bacon observes: 'The story which R here interjects not only interrupts the context so grossly as to make the members of the Jewish senate (!) engage in the pastime described in verse 65, but is historically impossible as well as logically useless. If the council was to assemble in the morning (xv. 1), of what service the midnight session? Once met, why disperse and reassemble, supposing this to be physically possible? Or again, since it is manifestly the purpose of the conspirators from the outset to escape responsibility by delivering Jesus over to Pilate as a disturber of the peace, what purpose can the trial serve? Then the conspirators gratuitously assume the very responsibility they wish to avoid. And all is done in violation of fundamental rules of Jewish jurisprudence forbidding night sessions, hasty executions, action on feast days, and the like. Why, above all, make the chief indictment blasphemy, when Jesus' own declaration of his Messiahship would not support the charge, and with the knowledge that if they do convict him they have no power to execute the sentence, whether directly or through Pilate? A more complete tissue of absurdities would be hard to frame than the story thus interjected by Mark where Luke proceeds in simple, logical order, without any interruption whatever (Luke xxii. 54–65).

'And the motive for the intercalation is so transparent! By just as much as the Jewish senate if they did wish to rid themselves of Jesus would have avoided the course here imputed to them, by so much is it a matter of concern with R to make them follow it. The detestable Jews, "who both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drove out us, and please not God and are contrary to all men," are responsible through their chief senate for the crime (for the animus *cp.* Matt. xxvii. 25). Moreover the real motive was the same unbelief which makes them now cry "Blasphemy" when the declaration is made that Jesus is the Christ. But the very elements which make this claim "blasphemy" to Jewish ears are the products of the "manifestation of Jesus as the Son of God by the resurrection." It is a simple anachronism to make the high priest treat the claim to Messiahship as if it involved already the claims of Pauline Christology. And besides all, it is not even claimed that the story comes from any eye or ear witness! At the utmost the saying about destroying and rebuilding the temple (verse 58), which really has a claim to emanate from Jesus, and is all the more probably authentic because R has cancelled it from the tradition of Jesus' real utterances, may have had a connection with the final tragedy. If so, it is before Pilate and not before Caiaphas that it would have significance. The connection of John ii. 19 and Mark xv. 29 suggests the possibility that the tradition once preserved a trace of the real onus of the charge which secured the desired condemnation from Pilate. One act, and only one, could be pointed to as evidence against the alleged Messianic agitator. He had lifted his hand against the control of the priests in the temple. Such a trace R may have found in his sources' (pp. 210, 211).

XV. 34.—Bacon remarks: 'Verse 34 is an interpretation in terms of Ps. xxii. 1 of verse 37, which Luke xxiii. 46 interprets in terms of Ps. xxxi. 6. Ev. Petri, which interprets the cry in a docetic sense as wrung from the physical nature of Jesus by the departure of his "power" ("my power, my power, why hast thou forsaken me?"), probably reflects the original intention of this remarkable elaboration on the cry by adding "and immediately he was taken up." In Luke also the cry is a commendation by Jesus of his spirit to God. Mark, who intermingles the utterances of the possessed and the possessing demons (*cp.* v. 7–12), could certainly employ a similar dualism here. The words of the cry are given partly in Hebrew by Matthew, wholly in Hebrew by the important Codex D in both Matthew and Mark. This is alone consistent with the misunderstanding of the bystanders, who speak Aramaic; besides the fact that the resemblance to the name "Elias" only appears in the Hebrew. Nevertheless, even were D's reading adopted we have no reason to treat verses 34–36 as other than an early interpretation of the inarticulate cry of verse 37. The quotation in a dead language of a prophecy supposedly fulfilled at Jesus' dying hour belongs with the scholasticism which in John xix. 28 records the alleged utterance "I thirst" as a "fulfilment." It has no place in real history. The whole elaboration verses 34–36 merely duplicates verse 37, combining with it the incident of the offer of vinegar (the soldiers' posca) to drink, a possible historic element but certainly regarded as a "fulfilment" of Ps. lxix. 21. The Roman soldier who can alone perform the act of verse 36 cannot be supposed to know the Elias legend, but may be supposed to be answering the bystanders' (p. 223).

XV. 40.—Bacon says: 'The story of the Burial, with its sequel, bears the marks of Palestinian origin in its local names and concrete description; but is certainly of secondary derivation. This is shown partly by its complete absence from the Pauline tradition, partly by its irreconcilability with the earlier context; for the disciples who had scattered and fled are now conceived as together in Jerusalem, needing a message to direct them to go to Galilee. The women also intend to prepare Jesus' body for burial, although it had already received better and more elaborate sepulture. Finally we note this author's pragmatic tendency towards the concrete and tangible type of resurrection belief such as the later legend develops, and his dethronement of Peter. In R's hand the Petrine tradition is ceasing to be individually Petrine in the historic sense, and becoming official. It is becoming less spiritual, and more crassly material. No longer is the manifestation of the Lord to Simon the foundation of the Christian faith and the rallying point of the "brethren," bringing them back from Galilee to experience together in Jerusalem the Pentecostal evidence of the Lord's risen power and the sense of their apostolic commission in the "baptism of the Holy Ghost." Henceforth the resurrection faith is to be built upon the empty tomb shown in Jerusalem on authority of the women; the journey to Galilee and return, an episode already emptied of meaning, is soon to be completely cancelled. Later still even the appearance to Peter *and the eleven disciples* becomes of secondary importance and soon suffers the fate of cancellation which it prepared for its predecessor, the appearance to Peter. The substitute previously interjected by R for the rallying of the eleven *by Peter* in Galilee and the subsequent promise of the angel show what R made of the original story' (p. 226).

XVI. 7.—Bacon observes: 'The disciples are assumed to be still at Jerusalem. The women are sent to remind them of the appointment in Galilee. But why were the first manifestations in Galilee, if not because the disciples had fled thither? Certainly not because Jesus wished to re-visit the home scenes for a few days before bringing the whole company back to Jerusalem. The whole Galilean episode becomes senseless if we drop the idea that the disciples had fled thither, and is therefore logically cancelled by Luke. This verse implies a form of the Gospel in which a manifestation to Peter and the eleven (or seven? Jn. 21, Ev. Petri) followed in Galilee. It proved equally unsatisfactory with that which it had superseded and was cancelled, leaving either a blank, or one, or both, of the spurious endings' (pp. 231, 232).

XVI. 1–8.—Holtzmann still thinks that the visit to the grave by the women is historic. The tomb *was* empty, because, for some reason or other, Joseph took the body away from the grave into which he had provisionally placed it and gave it a more permanent sepulture elsewhere. See the article, 'Das leere Grab und die gegenwärtigen Verhandlungen über die Auferstehung Jesu,' in the *Theologische Rundschau*, Vol. IX. (1906).

MATTHEW XXI. 28.—The reading defended by Merx is also accepted by Mr Hart. He finds the 'probable source' from which Jesus derived 'the germ of the Parable of the Two Sons' to be Ecclesiasticus xix. 21, 'A servant saying to his master, As it pleaseth I will not do; if thereafter he do, he angereth his nurturer.' Mr Hart most ingeniously observes that Jesus 'put before the Pharisees the case of a son who refused to obey and obeyed, together with its natural complement, the case of a son who promised to obey and did not keep his promise. He asked them to decide which of them did the will of his father. The textual authorities are divided in their report of the decision; but there can be no doubt that the reading which is repugnant to later Christian scribes is the original. *Proclivi lectioni praestat ardua.* The Pharisees decided in favour of the son who promised obedience, in accordance with the ruling of their predecessor that the other angered his nurturer. It was within the power of both to promise or refuse obedience. The son who promised did his duty at the time; and the other rebelled. Intention is the criterion which they employ.' (*Ecclesiasticus: The Greek Text of Codex* 248, edited with a textual commentary and prolegomena by J. H. A. Hart (1909), p. 288.)

LUKE V. 12, 13.—The verbal agreements between Matthew and Luke in these verses as against Mark may be regarded as an argument for the theory that all three Gospels here depend upon Q, or that at least Matthew and Luke knew and used a Q version of the story.

X. 37.—On the other hand how sadly true is Prof. Becker's remark: 'Der "Nächste" ist übrigens—trotz Jesus—dem Christen wie dem Muhammedaner immer nur der Glaubensgenosse gewesen' (*Christentum und Islam*, p. 31). The particularism of creed is even worse than the particularism of race in some respects. It is more artificial.

XX. 41.—Johannes Weiss, in a review of Spitta's *Streitfragen*, observes: 'Dass Jesus in diesem Gespräch die Davidsohnschaft des Messias leugne, ist eine zweifellos falsche Auslegung der alten Kritik; er sagt nur, dass dies Prädikat nicht das einzige, nicht das charakteristische, nicht das wesentliche ist. Und das ist zu ersehen auch bei Mk. und Mtth. Ich stimme Spitta auch darin völlig bei, dass die Abstammung Jesu von David den alten Christen (vgl. Röm. i. 4) als ganz zweifellos galt von Anfang an und zwar nicht bloss als Folgerung aus seiner Messianität, sondern als Voraussetzung. Und ebenso bin ich mit ihm einig, dass Jesus

gar nicht auf den Gedanken hätte kommen können, zum Messias berufen zu sein, wenn er nicht überzeugt gewesen wäre, aus dem Hause Davids zu stammen. Hierzu bedarf es nun freilich nicht der Bethlehem Geburt, sondern nur der Familientradition' (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1909, col. 463).

INDEX

Vol. II begins on p. 393

Abomination of Desolation, 304, 739
Adultery, 235 ff., 239 ff., 506, 509, 1001; woman taken in, 282
Advent, second, *see* Parousia
Almsgiving, 529, 531, 539
Am ha'aretz, lxxv ff., xcix, 480
Anger, teaching of Jesus and of the Rabbis concerning, 500 ff.
Ani'im, *Anawim*, 477
Anna, 862
Anointing in Bethany, 313 ff.
Anti-Semitism, 520, 524, 1019
Anxiety for the morrow, warning against, 542 ff., 956
Apocalyptic, oration, 299 ff., 738 ff., 1044 ff.; writers, Jesus's relation to, lxxix, 51
Apostles, call of, 62, 85, 112 f., 885; mission of the twelve, 147, 578 ff.; power over unclean spirits, 148; later date of instructions to, in Matthew, 588; special honour promised to, 1057 f.; Jesus's last speech to, 1061 ff.; bidden to prepare for conflict, 1062
Ascension, 1097

Baptism, of John, 43, 463; of the Spirit, 44, 463; of Jesus, 45–48, 464, 867 f.
Barabbas, 363, 368, 770, 1077
Beelzebul, 115, 621, 624
Bethany, 313 ff.
Bethlehem, 459 f., 857 f.
Buddhistic parallels in Gospel narratives, 466 f., 652, 863

Cæsar, payment of tribute to, 280 f.
Cæsarea Philippi, Peter's confession at, 193 ff.
Census, 857 f.
Centurion at the cross, 375, 1083
Christ, *see* Messiah
Christian community, presupposed in Matthew, lvii, 665, 701, 718; continued presence of Jesus in, xlix, 682, 782; symbolised in story of feeding of five thousand, 155; teaching addressed to, 474 f., 551 f., 554, 588, 643 f., 887, 894, 956; attitude regarding Eucharistic assemblies, 548; duties and rights of, 680 ff.; power assigned to, 681; warning to heads of, 743; duty of active work for, 747; relation of Matthew's parables to, 751; *see also* Christianity, Kingdom of God
Christianity, treatment of religious enemies, xviii, 520, 524, 890, 925, 941, 1018 f., 1080; introduced changes in the teaching of Jesus, xc–xciv, 1099; influence, of motive 'for Christ's sake' in, 226, 754, of moral ideal in, 526; assigns worth to every soul, 754; *see also* Christian community, Gospels, Jesus
Corban, 164–166
Crucifixion, 368 ff., 773, 1079 f.; day of the, 309 ff., 379, 776, 965; measure of Jewish responsibility for, 345 ff., 354 f., 361 ff., 382

Darkness at the crucifixion, 371, 1082
Demons, supposed cause of nervous disorders, 65; demonology of the age, 66, 138, 633; Jesus shares popular belief in, 66, 140, 633; freedom of old Israelite religion and the prophets from belief in, 66, 140; entrance of, into herd of swine, 137 ff., 566, 911; exorcism of, by Jews, 621
Dietary laws, *see* Religious defilement
Disciples, the seventy, symbolism of the number, 928; return of, 930; *see also* Apostles

Discipleship, conditions of, 205, 248, 250, 563 f., 918, 926, 978 ff.; mark of, 552

Disease an implication of sin, *see* Sin

Divorce, in Rabbinic law and in Jesus's teaching, 235 ff., 239 ff., 508 ff., 688 ff., 1001

Double morality, doctrine of a, 211, 695, 981 f.; opposition of Judaism to, 211, 691

Dualism, Johannine doctrine of, 750

Dying to live, principle of, originally eschatological, 206; tendency to induce false individualism, 211, 918; its influence for good, 211 f., 919; Jewish criticism of, 918

Ebionite fragments, 1020

Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani, 371 ff.; omitted by Luke, 1082

Elijah, and John the Baptist, 215 f., 670; invocation of, 373 f.; Jesus compared with, 925 f.

Elizabeth, the Baptist's mother, 847 f., 853 f.

Emmaus, 1091 ff.

End, the, xcv f., 301–307, 643, 740 f., 961, 1044 ff.

Enemies, the love of, 519 ff., 523 f., 526, 889 ff., 941, 1018 f., 1080

Entry into Jerusalem, 267 ff., 707, 1031 f.

Essenes, relation of Jesus to, lxxix, 491, 507, 511

Eternal life, attainment of, 247, 933; by renunciation, 248 ff., 695 f., 981; result of grace, 700; not a reward in proportion to desert, 701 f.

Eternal punishment, doctrine of, 117, 752 ff.; attitude of Judaism towards, 118, 232; apparently accepted by Jesus, 550, 1005

Exorcism, in Jesus's name, 229 f.; Jewish, 621

Fasting, 88 f., 537 f., 671, 940

Following Christ, influence of conception upon the world, 210

Forgiveness, duty of, in Rabbinic teaching, 536 f., 684, 686, in teaching of Jesus, 685; Jesus's prayer from the Cross, 1079 ff.

Forgiveness of sins, lxxxvii f., 43, 76, 118; prerogative of God, 77 ff., 905; power to forgive sin claimed by Jesus, 79 ff., 905, on behalf of mankind, 79, 82, 568 f.

Gadarenes (Gergesenes), 138

Galilæans, massacre of, 964

Galilee, condition of in the age of Jesus, lxxxiii

Gehenna, 232, 501, 1003

Genealogy of Jesus, in Matthew, 452; in Luke, 869

Gentiles, Jesus's attitude towards, lxxxv, xcii, 180, 547, 579, 657 f., 928; *see also* Luke

Gethsemane, 336, 1065 f.

Golden rule, 549 f., 891

Gospel, meaning of the word, xxii, 40; usage in Mark, in Matthew and Luke, 41, 206; as good tidings, xxii, 41, 57 f., 315; teaching of, summed up in the precept of charity, 754

Gospels, Synoptic, Jewish attitude towards, xvii f., ci ff., civ, cvi; meaning and origin of the term Synoptic, xx f.; sources of, xxiii, lxii; authenticity of sayings attributed to Jesus in, xlviii, 1079 f.: relation of date to authenticity, lxvii; influence on European history, ci; value of, for Judaism, ciii, cv f.; genius of, civ f., 181, 545; dramatic power of, 698; variety of spirit in, 731; *see also* Jesus, his teaching, Mark, Matthew, Luke

Greatest commandment, 287, 933

Greatness, standard of, 224 f., 258 f., 676 f., 922, 1055 ff.

Healing, Jesus's acts of, lxxxvii, 65 f.; commands for silence with regard to, 65, 73 f., 139, 142, 144; the outcome of pity, 66; on the Sabbath, 68, 108, 966, 973; by touch, 68, 183; historic basis of, 71 ff., 141, 183, 559; as sign of forgiveness, 76; dependent upon faith, 144, 146, 220 ff.; confused with magic, 150; by word, 559, 561; by laying on of hands, 877; *see also* Demons, Miracles

Herod Antipas, lxviii f., 152, 159, 457 f., 650, 1074 ff.

Herodians, 109, 279

High Priest, 346, 866

Hillel, 235 f.

Holy Spirit, blasphemy against, 117, 623 f., 953; request for reception of, essence of Christian prayer, 941

Householder and his treasure, *see* New and old

Humility, 1021 f.

Idealism in religion, value of, cv, 526; relation of, to Judaism, 527

Imitation of Christ, far-reaching effect of, 527, 924

Immanence, theory of, 1014

Jerusalem, lament over, 733 f., 971; prediction of fall of, 1033; entry into, 267 ff., 707, 1031 f.

Jesus, his teaching, lxxxiv f., xciv, xcvi, c f., cvii, 53, 59, 225, 463, 497, 523, 539, 545, 555, 592 f., 646, 1022, 1098; attitude of Jewish scholars towards, xvii; relation of Judaism to, xix; prophetic character of, lxxxiv ff., c; changes made in, after his death, xc–xciv; spirit of, civ f.; counter to letter of the Law, 172, 187, 466, 655; concerning—self-denial, 211, 916, anger, 500 ff., oaths, 511 f., retaliation, 513 ff., 521, 546, 1009, love of enemies, 519 ff., 523 f., 890 ff., 941, prayer, 530 ff., 549, 1017 f., 1021 f., duty of forgiveness, 685; as fulfilment of the Law, 474, 488 f., 491 f., 495, 508, 550, 1000; ascetism in, 507, 691, 695, 1020; Jewish criticism of, 523 f.; inwardness of, 530, 538; inspiration of, 870; *see also* Sermon on the Mount, Service

His attitude towards—sinners, lxxviii, lxxxiv, 86, 574, 985; national questions, lxxx, 53, 262; Judaism, 89, 599, 711; opponents, 108, 500, 519, 521, 524 f., 625, 713, 890, 925, 1036; family ties, 119, 253, 564, 585, 634, 864, 943; children, 228, 243 f., 679; civil power, 280 f.; *see also* Gentiles, Law, Poverty, Tradition, Women

Main dates of his life, lxviii, xcv, 313, 857, 869; classes with whom he came in contact, lxxvii ff.; his compassion, lxxviii, 66, 154, 185, 573; his power of healing, lxxxvii, 65; his conception of his relation to God, lxxxix, xciii f., 605 ff., 612 ff.; causes of his conflicts with Jewish authorities, lxxxviii ff., xciv; his anticipation of his death, xciii, 201 f., 314, 327, 961 f., 970; problems raised by his life, xciv ff.; his belief in imminent end of the world, xcv f., 301, 496, 542, 544, 890, 1044; his relation to the 'masses,' xcix, 480; did he intend to found a new religion? c f.; his place in Judaism, ci, cvii, 594, 1099; shares popular superstitions, 66, 140, 633; his faith, 143, 222, 273, 549; his character, 149, 181 f., 243, 247, 296, 543, 735; his moral inerrancy, 246 f., 535, 626, 628, 633, 890; his monotheism, 246, 288, 593, 782; suffering at Gethsemane, 336 ff., 1066; his arrest, 341, 346, 761, 1067 f.; his trial, before the Sanhedrin, 346–357, 762 ff., 1070 ff., before Pilate, 359–366, 771, 1073–1077, before Herod, 1074 ff.; words from the cross, 371 ff., 1079 f., 1082; his death, 371 ff., 774, 1082 ff., result of, 381 f., as sin offering, 759; his burial, 378 ff., 1085; conception of progress after death unknown to him, 462, 744; founder of a new era, 593 f.; legend of his boyhood, 864; his conception of God, 941; 'warlike' tone of his last speech to Apostles, 1062; the last of the prophets, 1098

See also Crucifixion, Healing, John the Baptist, Messiah, Messianic Consciousness, Passion, Resurrection, Temptation

Jews, the, attitude towards the Gospels, xvii f., ci ff.; attitude of Christianity towards, xviii, lxx, 520, 890, 925, 1019, 1080; condition of, during age of Jesus, lxviii ff., lxxiii f., lxxix; consecrated by suffering, 382; doctrine of predestined mental darkening of, 638

John, the Apostle, prediction of his martyrdom unfulfilled, 258

John the Baptist, 42, 152, 462, 600 f., 650 f., 898 f.; as forerunner of the Messiah, 44, 47, 215, 592; his attitude towards Jesus, 44, 276, 589 f., 596, 601; story of his death legendary, 153; identified with Elijah, 215 f., 670; his authority, 275; his teaching, 463, 867; precursor of the Judgment, 463; his position in the Kingdom, 592, 595 f., 899; eulogised by Jesus, 594; relation to Jesus, 595, 899; Jewish origin of story of his birth, 847 f.

John the Elder, and the Gospel of Mark, xviii, xxv ff., xxxv

John, Gospel of, reason for its omission, xxi; peculiar conception of Jesus in, xxi; doctrine of dualism in, 750

John Mark, *see* Mark

Jonah, sign of, 629 f., 944

Joseph of Arimathaea, 346, 378 ff., 775, 1085

Joseph, the husband of Mary, 849 f., 857 f.

Judaism, 92, 235, 527, 556; relation to Jesus's teaching, xviii f.; monotheism in, lxxx f., 288, 593; condition of, before and after destruction of the State, lxxxii, 625 ff.; conception of God as Father in, xcix, 593, 710, 948; relation of modern Judaism to Unitarian Christianity, ci, 593 f.; must come to terms with the gospels, cii, 906; value of New Testament to, ciii;

Judaism, *contd.*
attitude of German Protestant theologians towards, 78, 173, 593, 610, 626, 683, 754, 894; conception of God as forgiving from free grace a fundamental feature of, 79; inwardness of Rabbinic religion, 79, 683, 696; compassion a characteristic of Rabbinic religion, 482; inwardness of Jesus's teaching not opposed to spirit of, 502, 506; opposed to celibacy, 507, 691 f.; Rabbinic ethics, 515; attitude towards enemies, 519 f., 523, 526, 1018 f.; teaching upon forgiveness in, 536 f., 684, 686; importance of filial piety in, 564; opposed to teaching of the Church not to that of Jesus, 593; purified Judaism the religion of the future, 594; burdens of Rabbinic laws contrasted with demands of Jesus, 609, 616; principle of retribution and reward in, 702, 750, 1009; importance attached to cleanliness in, 946; attitude towards Gentiles, 947; universalism of present day Judaism, 948; impossibility of compromise between orthodox Jew and orthodox Christian, 1006
In the age of Jesus, connection of Church and State in, lxx; not a priestly religion, lxxi; fanaticism in, lxxii f.; relation of Rabbis to the people, lxxvi, xcix; liberal tendencies, lxxviii f.; apocalyptic writers, lxxix; contradictions of, lxxx; proselytism, lxxxi
See also Eternal punishment, Jesus, Law, Legal religion, Liberal Judaism, Repentance, Women
Judas Iscariot, betrayal by, 316, 340 f., 756, 1047, Jesus's prediction of, 319, 758, 1053; legendary account of his death, 768
Judge, the Unjust, 1017 ff.
Judgment, the Last, xcviii, 752, 953, 963, 965, 1098; Christian charity the test at, 754
Justification by works, 539, 554, 894

Kingdom of God (of Heaven), xcvi, 47, 52 ff., 123, 193, 197, 209, 244, 288, 301 f., 328, 332, 647, 697, 712, 745, 968, 977 f., 1029; as already present, lvi, 60, 289, 477, 479, 596, 622, 715, 929, 999, 1013 f.; as Christian Community, lvii, 133 f., 289, 479, 493, 596, 638, 640 ff., 645, 665 f.; conception of, in Matthew, lvi f., 478, in Mark, 478, in Luke, 479; central feature of Jesus's teaching, lxxxv; senses in which Jesus used the expression, 59 ff., 250, 1012 ff., 1058; compared to a process, 129 ff.; taken by force, 597 f., 999

L., extra source of Luke, lxi, 847; passages thought by B. Weiss to be derived from, lxi f., 847, 867, 872, 879, 888 f., 894, 896 f., 901, 904, 943, 946 f., 949, 957 f., 961 f., 965, 967, 973 f., 976 f., 979, 984 f., 1002, 1005, 1007 ff., 1020, 1026, 1029, 1034, 1037, 1039, 1046 ff., 1059, 1065, 1067, 1073, 1076, 1078, 1080 ff., 1083 f., 1085, 1087, 1091, 1094; *see also* Luke, sources of
Last Supper, influence of Paul on conception of, xxxii, 330 ff., 1051; origin of, 156, 329, 332, Jewish attitude towards, 321; meaning of, 322 ff.; development of, 329; account of, in Luke, 1049 ff., 1054
Law, the, domination of, unsuited for national independence, lxix f.; after the fall of the State, lxix f., lxxiv; intolerance of, lxxi ff.; growth of, lxxi; had not a fair chance politically, lxxiii; more spiritual when universal, lxxiv, lxxviii
Relation of, to the people, lxix f., lxxvi f., 481, 609; relation of the Church to, lxxi f., xci, 488, 499; legalism of 30, and of 300 and 600 A.D., lxxiv ff., lxxxii; Jesus's attitude towards, lxxxvi, xci, c f., 72, 163, 168–176, 237 f., 487–496, 498, 558, 673, 688, 725 f.; Rabbinic conception of, 87, 166, 172, 187, 499, 552; divineness of, 87, 490, 655, 1001; contrasted with the new teaching, 497; difference between letter and spirit recognized by Rabbis, 499; not merely external, 503; *Lex talionis*, 513 f., 517; standard of holiness in, 522; observance of the spirit of, in Rabbinic religion, 711; duration and value of, 999 ff.
See also Judaism, Matthew
Lazarus, 1003 ff.
Legal religion, lxxxiii, 79, 93, 173, 529, 536, 609, 626, 696, 1022
Lex talionis, 513 f., 517
Liberal Judaism, 90, 92, 173, 176, 288, 556, 906, 947; its relation to teaching of Jesus, xix, ci, cvii
Life of the resurrection, 285, 1038
Logia of Matthew, xlvii, li; *see also* Q
Love and forgiveness, 902, 905 f.
Luke, Gospel of, date, xxiii, lxii, lxvi; dependence upon Mark, xxxiii, xxxvi, lii, lxiii, 206, 845, 866; relation to Matthew, xxxvi, li, lv, lxii f., 553, 580,

Luke, *contd.*
958, 962, 986, 1070; sources of, lx ff., 844 f., 847, 867, 874, 879, 888, 916 ff., 923 f., 934, 1038, 1065, 1072, 1089; 'Insertion' into Marcan narrative, lxiii, 923; relation to fourth gospel, lxiii, 1038, 1068; conception of Jesus in, lxiv, lxvi, 873, 877, 991, 1067; geography of, lxiv, 923, 969, 1025; Pauline influence in, lxiv, 954, 1038 f., 1051, 1053; Gospel of forgiveness and humility, lxv; divergence in account of the Passion in, 337 f., 342, 350, 352, 1064; conception of Kingdom in, 479; author not an eye-witness, 844; legendary character of first two chapters, 847; Virgin birth originally not included in, 849, 859, 867; parables peculiar to, 932, 954, 965, 988, 992, 1017, 1021; emphasizes Jesus's popularity in Jerusalem, 1034; omissions in account of the trial, 1070 ff., 1077; conception of the resurrection in, 1089

Characteristics of:—lxiv ff.; universality, lxiv, lxvi, 869, 935; Gentile point of view, lxiv, lxvi, 578, 872, 875, 896, 925, 928, 935; sympathy with sinners and the poor, lxiv; antagonism to the rich, lxv, 995, 998, 1002; interest in healing, 877; prominence given to women, 901 f., 907, 943

Passages peculiar to, lx, lxiii, 844–864, 867, 873, 875, 878, 889, 892, 896, 905, 907, 922, 929 f., 932 f., 937, 940, 943, 954, 959 f., 964, 966, 969, 973 f., 988, 996, 998, 1001, 1008 f., 1012, 1017, 1021, 1026, 1029, 1033, 1038, 1049, 1059, 1061, 1066, 1068, 1074, 1078, 1081, 1083, 1090, 1094; authenticity of, lx, lxv

See also L., Q

Maccabees, Fourth book of, influence of, 1039

Magi, 457

Magnificat, said by Elizabeth, 853

Malefactors, the two, 1081

Mammon, 540; of unrighteousness, 994 f., 997

Mark, Gospel of, date, xxiii, xxxv, xli, 300; sources of, xxiii f., xxxiii, xli; earliest gospel, xxiii, xxxvi, origin, xxv, xxxv; supposed identity of author with John Mark, xxv; referred to by Papias and John the elder, xxv ff.; relation of Peter to, xxvi–xxxi, xxxv; different elements in, xxxi; historical character, xxxi f., xliii; Pauline influence in, xxxii f., 57, 190, 208, 217, 219 f., 229, 260, 304, 330 f., 392; conception of Jesus in, xxxi, 48, 111, 991; narrative source of, xxxiv ff., 135, 195, 213, 368; object of, xl; place of origin, xli; divisions of, xlii; author's theory of Messianic consciousness of Jesus, 64, 197, 214, 275; passages peculiar to, 88, 92, 129, 190, 244, 271, 343, 379; private teaching indicative of secondary portions, 123, 221, 238, 302; conception of Kingdom in, 478

Characteristics of:—depreciation of Galilæan Apostles, xxx, xxxii; small space given to Jesus's words, xl; healing by touch, 68, 183; obduracy of the Jews, 83; commands for silence, 65, 73 f., 110, 139, 144, 184, 197; isolated sayings of Jesus, 127 f., 234; obtuseness of disciples, 158, 167, 189 f., 203, 337, 670, 672

See also Petrine reminiscences, Q

Martha of Bethany, 937 f.

Mary of Bethany, 937 f.

Mary, the mother of Jesus, 453 f., 849 ff., 852, 858 f.; unaware of Jesus's Messiahship, 119, 860; not of Davidic descent, 849; purification of, 860

Matthew, Gospel of, date, xxiii, xlvii, liv, lix, 581; relation of, to Mark, xxxiii, xxxvi, xlii f., 57, 206, 451, 567, 656 f., 675, 709, 715, 755, 757, to Luke, xxxvi, li, lv, lxii f., 553, 580, 958, 962, 986, 1070; Matthean Logia, xlvii, li; sources other than Q and Mark, l ff.; parables peculiar to, liii, 639, 644, 700 f., 710, 744; point of view, liii; relation to Judaism, liii f., lv; Jewish-Christian origin of author, liv, lviii f.; attitude towards the Law, liv f., 481, 560, 725, 728; Christian community presupposed in, liv f., lvii, 665, 701, 718, 751; combination of 'particularism' and 'universalism' in, liv, lviii f., 559 f., 578; most in touch with the Talmud, lv; catholicism of, lv, lviii; conception of Kingdom in, lvi f., 478; authenticity, of Jesus's sayings in, lvi f., lix, of narratives in, lviii; object of, 451; conception of Jesus in, 455, 694; identification of author with Levi, 570; manipulation of traditional records, 650 f.; identifies Jesus with Son of Man, 953

Characteristics of:—fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies, liv, lviii, 454, 471, 493, 619, 642; prejudice against Pharisees, lv, 287, 462, 721; objection to miraculous healing, 191;

Matthew, *contd.*
use of phrase 'Kingdom of Heaven,' 462, 479; emphasis on 'righteousness,' 481, 543, 586; omission of human touches about Jesus, 557, 693 ff.; healing by word, 559, 561; relation between man and God represented as service, 710
Passages peculiar to, xliii, 450–460, 472, 497, 505, 510, 528, 530, 537, 547, 566, 578, 580, 582, 608, 617, 619, 639, 643 ff., 663, 672, 684, 695, 699, 708, 710, 728, 744, 751, 767, 773, 776, 778, 780; character of, li
See also Q
Messiah, expectation of, lxxiv; Jesus's conception of, lxxx, lxxxviii f., xcvii f., 49 ff., 100, 102 f., 197 ff., 290 ff., 361, 469 f., 764; Messianic claim as cause of Jesus's condemnation, lxxxix, 349 ff., 355, 361 f.; Jewish conception of, xcvi ff., 48, 50 f., 100 f., 111, 292, 469 f., 602, 1046; of Isaiah xi, xcvii, 49 f., 52, 198, 620; used as a name, 41, 453; as suffering servant, 55, 193, 215, 263 f., 467; temptation of, 56; Mark's conception of, 111; concealment of Messiahship, 160, 197, 917; Messianic entry, 267 ff., 707, 1031 f.
Messianic consciousness of Jesus, lxvii, lxxxviii f., xcv, xcvii f., 39, 46–53, 58, 64, 100–106, 111, 196 ff., 214, 262 ff., 275, 291, 353, 602, 764 f., 1032
Miracles, xxiv, xxx, 65 f., 71, 74, 108, 142 ff., 146, 154, 179, 184, 191, 466, 590, 631, 652, 674; *see also* Healing
Mishnah, 162, 164 f.
Money, right use of, *see* Wealth
Monotheism, 288; fundamental doctrine of Judaism, lxxx f., 593

Nain, raising of the young man of, 896 f.
Narrow gate, the, 550, 968
Nazareth, 459, 849, 872; rejection of Jesus at, 145, 872 ff.
New and old, religion of Jesus combination of, 646
New Testament, *see* Gospels

Oaths, 511 f.
Old Testament, its relation to the New Testament, ciii; influence of, on Gospel narratives, 71, 136, 141, 155 ff., 218, 477, 564, 591, 608 ff., 682, 757, 768, 847, 897, 1078

Papias, his account of the Gospel of Mark, xxv ff., of Matthew, xlvii, li
Parables, 121; reasons for teaching in, 637
Parousia, 130, 208 f., 301 f., 588, 734, 738, 742 f., 747 f., 751, 958, 1012, 1016, 1020, 1029 f., 1046
Particularism, Jewish, 100, 289; Christian, 289, 719; doctrine that few are 'saved,' 251, 719, 748
Passion, Jesus's predictions of his, 193 ff., 201 ff., 209, 215, 223, 255, 257 f., 263 f., 315, 333, 917, 921, 1024, 1064; narrative of, in Mark, 308, 335
Passover, 309 ff., 317 f., 1047, 1049 f.
Paul, 593, 674, 692
Pauline influence, in Mark, xxxii f., 57, 190, 208, 217, 219 f., 229, 260, 304, 330 f., 392; in Luke, lxiv, 954, 1038 f., 1051, 1053; on Jewish proselytes, lxxxi
Peter, 193; his relation, to Gospel of Mark, xxvi–xxxi, to the narrative source, xxxv, to Q, xxxvii; his denial, 335, 358, 766, 1060, 1069; his primacy and position in the Church, 663 ff.; call of, 879; his vision of the risen Jesus, 1093
Petrine reminiscences in Mark, xxix ff., xxxv, 62, 67, 113, 196, 217, 334, 337, 339, 359, 392
Pharisees, consisted of Rabbis and their followers, lxxi; majority of population, lxxi, lxxvii; account of, in Gospels not unprejudiced, lxxv, lv, 287, 462, 721; popularity of, lxxvii, xcix; Particularist tendencies, lxxviii; devotion to the ceremonial Law, lxxviii; opposition to Jesus, 75, 85, 88, 91, 108 f.; observance of tradition, 162–166; ask for a sign, 186 ff., 631; leaven of, 189 f., 661 f., 952; attitude towards Rome, 280; accused of hypocrisy, 295; said to be 'money loving,' 998; *see also* Law
Pilate, desire of Evangelists to exonerate, 345, 355, 362 f., 365, 703, 771, 1074 ff.; his attitude to Jesus, 364 f.
Poverty, Apostolic, 150; Jesus's attitude towards, 249, 251, 477, 541, 543, 991, 995; *see also* Wealth
Prayer, the Lord's, 532 ff., 940; injunction of constant, 1017 f.; of the tax-collector, 1021 f.; *see also* Jesus, his teaching
Precepts which cannot be kept literally, 523 f., 890 f.
Priesthood, mainly responsible for condemnation of Jesus, xci, 346, 364, 382
Prodigal son, 989 ff.
Prophets, false, warning against, 551

Q [*Quelle*], xxxvi, xliii f., lii, 42, 44, 46, 121, 195, 303, 464, 546, 583, 586; Peter's relation to, xxxvii; relation to Mark, xxxvii–xli, xlvi f., 43, 46, 56, 71, 75, 115, 117, 121, 127, 132, 144, 147, 149, 161, 186, 204 ff., 218, 226 ff., 231 f., 234, 238, 259, 274, 287, 299, 303, 475, 486, 623, 625, 656, 725; conception of Jesus as Messiah in, 104, 106; passages ascribed to, in Matthew, xliii ff., liii, 44, 46, 462 f., 465 ff., 473, 483, 486, 493, 496, 504, 508, 528, 532 f., 547, 553, 558 ff., 562, 565 ff., 571 f., 574 f., 578 ff., 583 ff., 589, 599 ff., 602 ff., 621 ff., 625, 629 f., 632, 642, 656, 660, 671, 675 ff., 679 ff., 697, 710, 721, 725, 732 f., 738, 743, 752, in Luke, xliii ff., lxii, 117, 259, 473, 483, 486, 560, 585, 866, 895, 898, 928, 942, 946, 954, 963, 984, 987, 992, 1008, 1017, 1020, 1029, 1059, 1061; account of the Passion not included in, xliv, xlvi, 755; character of, xlvi; date and origin of, xlvii f.

Rabbis and Rabbinic religion, *see* Judaism, Legal religion, Pharisees
'Receiveth me,' meaning of, 226; sense in which Jesus can be 'received,' 227
Religious defilement, 168–176, 656, 729, 948 f.
Renunciation, *see* Dying to live, *also* Eternal life, attainment of
Repentance, Rabbinic teaching upon, 679, 744, 987, 990; necessity of, before the Judgment, 963 ff.; beloved of God, 984 ff., 989 ff.
Resurrection of Jesus, real foundation for narratives of, 383; possibility of a supernatural manifestation, 384, a subjective vision, 385; the empty tomb, 386 ff., 778 f., 1087 f.; later version of, 391; prediction of, on third day, 667; day of the, 777; legendary character of, the sealing of the tomb, 776 f., of the bribing of the soldiers by Jewish authorities, 780; Luke's conception of, 1089; appearance, at Emmaus, 1091 ff., to Peter, 1093, at Jerusalem, 1095 f.; corporeality of the risen Jesus, 1095
Retribution and reward, principle of, *see* Judaism, *also* Jesus, his teaching regarding retaliation, *also Lex talionis*
Riches, danger of, *see* Poverty, Wealth

Sabbath, healing on, 68, 108, 966, 973; man's lordship over, 91 ff., 618
Sadducees, lxx, 285, 346, 382, 462, 660 f.
Salt, disciples compared to, 233, 486, 981
Samaritan, parable of the good, 932–937; originally independent of story of the greatest commandment, 933 f.
Satan, 115 ff., 124, 466, 468, 1059; Jesus's vision of the fall of, 930 f.
Scribes, their conflicts with Jesus, 77 ff., 85, 88, 115 ff., 164 ff., 275 f.; attack on the, 294, 725, 946; drawn from common people, 717; *see also* Law, Rabbinic conception of
Sepphoris, 531
Sermon, on the Mount, 473–556, in the Plain, 887–894; its excellence not dependent on its authenticity, xlviii; a meeting-ground for Christian and Jew, cvii, 555; in Q, 473 ff., in Matthew, 474 f., 484, 889; addressed to Christian community, 474 f., 887, 894; beatitudes, 476 f., 484, 889; the 'poor' and 'meek,' 480 f.; eudæmonism in, 483, 485, 529; based on supposition of approaching end of the world, 496, 542, 544, 890; teaching of, 517 f., 555 f.; absence of Christology in, 555; in Luke, 887 f., 889; the woes, 889; interpretation of paradoxes in, 891
Servant passages of Isaiah, influence on the Gospels, 48, 55, 291
Service, characteristic of Jesus's teaching, 53, 225 ff., 259 f., 269, 1057; *see also* Greatness, standard of
Shammai, 235 f., 240
Shechinah, 683
Sign, Jesus refuses a, 186, 629 ff., 660
Siloam, 77, 965
Simon, the leper, 314; the Pharisee, 901
Sin implied by suffering, 77, 965
Sinner, the woman who was a, 901; interpretations of the story of, 902 ff.; *see also* Anointing in Bethany
Sirach, influence of, 608 f.
Slave, man's relation to God that of a, 1008
Son of David, 261, 290 ff., 452, 1040
Son of God, lxxxix, xciii, 41, 47 f., 105, 111, 277, 293, 351 f., 375, 605 f., 612 ff., 1071
Son of man, meaning of, 79–81, 83, 207, 209 f., 305, 353, 562, 568, 624, 663, 884, 953, 1015, in O.T. and apocryphal books, 93–95, 98, in Synoptic Gospels, 95–106, in Q, 104, 106
Steward, the wise and foolish, 959 f.; the unjust, 992 ff.
Stumbling-blocks, 231 f., 506, 677 f.
Swine, demons and the, 137 ff., 566, 911

Swords, disciples commanded to provide themselves with, 1061 ff.

Talents, parable of, 747 ff., 1029 f.
Talmud, 225
Temple, devotion of the Jews to, lxxi; prediction of destruction of, lxxxiv, 300, 763, as cause of Jesus's condemnation, 348 ff.; purification of, 271 f., 276, 708 f., 1034; rending of the veil of, 375; tribute, 672; members of early Church frequent the, 1097
Temptation of Jesus, as Messianic, 56; origin of story of, 466; form of, 466–471
Tradition, Jesus's attitude to, 162 f.; in connection with Corban, 165
Transfiguration, the, 213 ff., 920
Trinity, only mention of, in authentic text of New Testament, 781

Unitarianism, li, 593 f., 906
Universalism, in Matthew, liv, lviii; in Luke, lxiv, lxvi, 869, 935; of teaching of Paul, lxxxi; of modern Judaism, 948
Urmarcus, *see* Mark, sources of

Vineyard, authenticity of parable of, 277 f., 392
Virgin birth, 454 f., 850 f., 864

Wealth, bias against, 249, 541, 995, 998, 1005, 1020; right use of, 993–997; present and future lot of, 1002 ff.
Widow's mite, 296
Wine, new and old, meaning of parable of, 89 f., 882
Wisdom of God, Apocalyptic book of, 730, 733 f., 949
Women, their position in Judaism, 235, 240, 508 ff., 689; Jesus's attitude towards, 242, 284, 377, 509 f., 903, 907; their presence at, the crucifixion, 376 f., 1084 f., the burial, 381, 1085, the empty tomb, 386 ff., 779, 1088; prominence given to, by Luke, 901 f., 907, 943; *see also* Divorce

Yoke of Jesus, 608 ff.

Zacchæus, 1026 ff.
Zebedee, sons of, Jesus refuses their demand, 257

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

BY CLAUDE G. MONTEFIORE

THE BIBLE FOR HOME READING.

Edited, with Comments and Reflections for the use of Jewish Parents and Children, by CLAUDE G. MONTEFIORE.

Part I. To the Second Visit of Nehemiah to Jerusalem.

Crown 8vo, 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Jewish World.—"A book that every Jewish father and mother should carefully study and keep as a reference book while training their children in the most important of all subjects of instruction."

Jewish Chronicle.—"By this remarkable work Mr Claude Montefiore has put the seal on his reputation. He has placed himself securely in the front rank of contemporary teachers of religion. He has produced at once a most original, a most instructive and a most spiritual treatise, which will long leave its ennobling mark on Jewish religious thought in England......Though the term 'epoch-making' is often misapplied, we do not hesitate to apply it on this occasion. We cannot but believe that a new era may dawn in the interest shown by Jews in the Bible."

Part II. Containing Selections from the Wisdom Literature, the Prophets, and the Psalter, together with Extracts from the Apocrypha.

Crown 8vo, 5*s.* 6*d.* net.

Jewish Chronicle.—"The scholarship, the spiritual insight, the attractive style which distinguished the first part of Mr Montefiore's *Bible for Home Reading* are displayed in their fullest development in the second part, now happily published. But, good as the older book was, the new is even better. Mr Montefiore had indeed a great responsibility. How wonderfully he has risen to the occasion, how splendid a use he has made of the opportunity, we shall endeavour to show. But we cannot refrain from saying that this book is the despair of a reviewer. One cannot hope to do justice to such a work when its 800 pages are full to overflowing of learning simply utilized, of moral truths reverently enunciated, of spiritual possibilities forcibly realized, while over all there hovers a charm indefinable, yet easily and inevitably felt by any reader of the book. We will, however, try to indicate some of the excellences of Mr Montefiore's book, the publication of which is the most important literary event of recent years, so far as the English-speaking Jews are concerned....As masterly as it is spiritual, as scholarly as it is attractive."

British Weekly.—"Although primarily intended for the use of Jewish homes, Mr Montefiore's edition of the Bible cannot fail to find its way into the hands of Christian parents. These will find in it much to instruct and much to edify."

LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.

BY CLAUDE G. MONTEFIORE

TRUTH IN RELIGION, AND OTHER SERMONS.

Delivered at the Services of the Jewish Religious Union. By Claude G. Montefiore.

Crown 8vo, 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Jewish World.—"The book is a notable addition to our all too scanty Anglo-Jewish pulpit literature. It is a book which reflects a great soul and a mind nicely balanced; a book which touches on questions of the highest import to us as men and as Jews—of purity and of holiness; of struggle and of peace; of sin and of forgiveness; of asceticism and of mysticism; of the mission of Israel and of his faith; of life, of death, of immortality;—a book, in fine, which will prove helpful and uplifting, and which no Jew and Jewess with a heart and a mind should leave unread."

THE BOOK OF PSALMS.

Edited, with Comments and Reflections, for the use of Jewish Parents and Children, by Claude G. Montefiore.

Crown 8vo, 1*s.* net.

Jewish Chronicle.—"No more acceptable treatment of the Psalter has ever been penned by a Jew. The critical attitude of the writer is illuminated by a deep reverence and spiritual appreciation. The chapter, for instance, on the Fifty-First Psalm, 'the noblest penitential hymn in all the world,' reveals Mr Montefiore as a religious thinker of the highest rank. But this excellence is not confined to a single chapter. The book ought to find a large and rapid sale."

BY ISRAEL ABRAHAMS

FESTIVAL STUDIES.

Being Thoughts on the Jewish Year. By I. Abrahams.

Crown 8vo, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Jewish World.—"Mr Abrahams has taken the Jewish Festivals and other topics which figure in the Prayer Book or are part of Jewish observance, and with all he deals happily. To those persons whose education has not left impress of the meaning and lessons of the periods which distinguished the Jewish calendar, 'Festival Studies' are enlightening; to others the pages play upon the sentiment reminiscent of early days."

LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., Ltd.

Date Due

BS
2555
M774
9173

Montefiore
The synoptic gospels
vol. II

DATE
ISSUED TO

BS
2555
M774
9173

Montefiore
The synoptic gospels
vol. II

DEMCO